

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR.

No. 419.

NEW SERIES.

No. 29.

THE MONTH

A Catholic Magazine.

MAY, 1899.



PRICE ONE SHILLING.

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND Co.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROTHERS.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

HISTORICAL PAPERS.

EDITED BY THE LATE REV. JOHN MORRIS, S.J.

1. **The Spanish Inquisition.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
2. **The False Decretals.** By the Rev. RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. 1d.
3. **Cranmer and Anne Boleyn.** By the Rev. JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. 2d.
4. **The Pallium.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 2d.
5. **The Immuring of Nuns.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 1d.
6. **The Huguenots.** By the Rev. WILLIAM LOUGHNAN, S.J. 1d.
7. **How "the Church of England washed her Face."** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
8. **St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572.** By the Rev. WILLIAM LOUGHNAN, S.J. 1d.
9. **The Rood of Boxley, or How a Lie Grows.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 3d.
10. **The First Experiment in Civil and Religious Liberty.** By JAMES CARMONT. 1d.
11. **Was St. Aidan an Anglican?** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
12. **The Gordon Riots.** By LIONEL JOHNSON, B.A. 1d.
13. **The Great Schism of the West.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.
14. **Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.

EDITED BY THE REV. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

15. **The Book of Common Prayer and the Mass.** By the Rev. R. C. LAING. 1d.
16. **Religious Instruction in England during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.** By DOM FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, O.S.B. 2d.
17. **England's Title: Our Lady's Dowry: Its History and Meaning.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 1d.
18. **Dr. Littledale's Theory of the Disappearance of the Papacy.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.
19. **Dean Farrar on the Observance of Good Friday.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 1d.
20. **Savonarola and the Reformation.** By the Very Rev. J. PROCTER, O.P. 3d.
21. **Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln.** By Mgr. W. CROKE ROBINSON. 2d.
22. **The English Coronation Oath.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 2d.
23. **Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland.** By the Rev. G. E. PHILLIPS. 3d.
24. **The Landing of St. Augustine.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
25. **The Hungarian Confession.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
26. **The Reformation at St. Martin's, Leicester.** By DUDLEY BAXTER, B.A.

The above in five volumes, cloth, price 1s. each.

LONDON: CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

v.

l.

T,

ES

.

.

EV

R.

d

g.

he

v.

P.

E

l.

v.

J.

A.

E.

Two Estimates of Catholic Life.

DEALING as both do so largely with the inner life of English Catholic society, it is hardly possible to avoid comparing and contrasting *One Poor Scruple*¹ with *Helbeck of Bannisdale*,—one the work of a Catholic who knows the matter she is handling, almost experimentally; the other the work of a gifted outsider whose singular talent, careful observation, and studious endeavour to be fair-minded, fail to save her altogether from that unreality and *à priori* extravagance which experience alone can correct. To the non-Catholic, Mrs. Humphrey Ward's book will appear a marvel of insight and acute analysis; for it will fit in with, and explain his outside observation of those Catholics with whom he has actually come in contact, far better than the preposterous notions that were in vogue fifty years ago. It represents them not as monstrously wicked and childish idolatrous; but as narrow, extravagant, out of date, albeit, well-meaning folk—more pitiable than dangerous.

Formerly when they lived secret and unknown, anything might safely be asserted about them; nothing was too wild or improbable. In those days "Father Clement" was the issue of a superhuman effort at charity and fairness; and the author almost seemed to think an apology was needed for such temerarious liberalism. But when Catholics began to breathe a little more freely and to creep out of their burrows somewhat less nervously; when, in fact, they were seen to be, at least in outward semblance, much as other men; some regard had to be paid to statements that could be checked by observation; and the Papist's disappointing ordinariness had to be attributed to dissimulation or to be otherwise interpreted into accord with the preposterous principles by which their lives were thought to be governed.

Mrs. Humphrey Ward represents the furthest advance of this reform. She at least has spared no pains to acquaint

¹ *One Poor Scruple*. By Mrs. Wilfrid Ward. London: Longmans, 1899.

herself with facts, to gather information, to verify statements. She is never guilty of the grotesque blunders that other high-class novelists fall into about Catholic beliefs, practices, and habits, simply because they are dealing with what is to their readers a *terra incognita*, and can, therefore, afford to be loose and inaccurate. An artistic conscientiousness which values truth and honesty in every detail, saves her from this too common snare. But it does not and cannot save her in the work of selection, synthesis, and interpretation of instances, which has to be guided, not by objective facts, but by subjective opinions and impressions. History written in a purely positivist spirit, *ad narrandum*, and in no sense *ad docendum*, is a chimerical notion by which Renan beguiled himself into thinking that his *Vie de Jesus* was a bundle of facts and nothing more. And Mrs. Humphrey Ward is no less beguiled, if she is unaware that in threading together, classifying and explaining the results of her conscientious observation and inquiry, she is governed by an *à priori* conception of Catholicism hardly different from that which inspired the author of "Father Clement." Hence, to us Catholics, though her evident desire to be critical and impartial is gratifying, yet her failure is none the less conspicuous. Dr. Johnson once observed, that what might be wonderful dancing for a dog would be a very poor performance for a Christian; and so, to us, "Helbeck" as a presentment of Catholic life is wonderful as coming from an outsider, and, perhaps, especially from Mrs. Humphrey Ward, but in itself it is grotesque enough—not through any culpable infidelity to facts, but through lack of the visual power, the guiding idea, whereby to read them aright.

In *One Poor Scruple*, Mrs. Wilfrid Ward brings to bear upon a somewhat similar task, an equal fidelity of observation supplemented by a first-hand, far wider, and more intimate experience of Catholics and their ways, and, above all, by that key which a share in their faith and beliefs alone furnishes to the right understanding of their conduct. Here too, no doubt, a contrary bias is to be suspected, nor is a purely, "positive" treatment of the subject conceivable or desirable. The view of an insider is as partial as the view of an outsider, though less viciously so; nor can we get at truth by the simple expedient of fitting the two together. The best witness is the rare individual who to an inside and experimental knowledge, adds the faculty of going outside and taking an objective and disinterested view.

In truth this needs an amount of intellectual self-denial seldom realized to any great degree; but we venture to say that Mrs. Wilfrid Ward proves herself very worthy of confidence in this respect. There is certainly no artistic idealizing of Catholics, such as we are accustomed to in books written for the edification of the faithful. There is the same almost merciless realism which we find in "Helbeck" in dealing with certain trivialities and narrownesses of piety—defects common to all whom circumstances confine to a little world, but more incongruous and conspicuous as contrasted with the dignity of Catholic ideals. Without conscious departure from truth, Mrs. Humphrey Ward is evidently influenced in her selection and manipulation of facts by the impression of Catholicism she already possesses and wants to illustrate and convey; but Mrs. Wilfrid Ward has, we think, risen above this weakness very notably, and should accordingly merit greater attention.

It may well be that this judicial impartiality may meet with its usual reward of pleasing neither side altogether. Some will complain that she brings no idealizing love to her subject, and does little to bring out the greatness and glory of her religion. Yet this would be a hasty and ill-judging criticism; for our faith is no less to be commended for the restraint it exercises over the multitude of ordinary men and women, than for the effect it produces in souls of a naturally heroic type. That it should bring a certain largeness into the smallest life, that it should impart a strange stability to a naturally unstable and frivolous character; that it should check the worldly-minded with a sense of the supreme claims of the other world—all this impresses us, if not with the sublimity or mystic beauty, at least with the solid reality and penetrating power of the Catholic faith.

The most loyal and deep-seated love needs not to shut its eyes to all defects and limitations, but can face them unchilled; and similarly there is often more faith and reverence and quiet enthusiasm in this seemingly cold and critical attitude towards the cause or party we love, than in the extravagant idealism that depends for its maintenance on an ignoring of things as they are.

Nothing perhaps is more unintelligible to the Protestant critic of Catholicism, nothing more needs to be brought out prominently, than the firm hold our religion can exercise over souls that are naturally irreligious.

This very phrase "naturally irreligious" will fall with a shock on sensitive Protestant ears; yet we use it advisedly. While all men are capable of faith and of substantial fidelity to the law of God, it is undeniable that but few are by natural inclination "religious" in the common acceptation of the term. As there is a poetic or mystical temperament, so also there is a religious temperament—not quite so rare, but still something exceptional. We find it so in all ages, ancient and modern; in all religions, Christian and non-Christian—nay, even amid agnostics and unbelievers we often detect the now aimless, unused faculty. But most men have, naturally, no ardent spiritual sympathy with holiness or mysticism, or heroism; their interests are elsewhere; and even where there are latent capacities of that kind, they are not usually developed until life's severest lessons have been learnt. Thus the young, who have just left the negative faith and innocence of the nursery behind them and stand inexperienced on the threshold of life, are not normally religious; whereas we naturally expect those who have passed through the ordeal, and been disillusioned, to begin to think about their souls, since there is nothing else left to think about.

Now, the Catholic religion clearly recognizes these facts of human nature, and accommodates herself to them. However frankly it may be acknowledged that a religious temperament—a certain complexus of mental, moral, and even physical dispositions—is a condition favourable to heroic sanctity, it must be emphatically denied that to be "religious," in the Protestant sense of the word, is requisite for salvation. And this denial the Church enforces by her recognition of the "religious state"¹ as an extraordinary vocation. The purpose of "orders" and "congregations" is to provide a suitable environment for people of a religious temperament whose circumstances permit them to attend to its development in a more exclusive and, as it were, professional way. Not, indeed, that all religious-minded persons do, or ought to, enter into that external state of life; nor that all who so enter are by temperament and sympathy fitted for it, but that the institution points to the Church's recognition of what is technically called the "way of perfection" as something exceptional and super-normal.

But the Church has a wider vocation than to provide hot-houses for the forcing of these rare exotics, whom the

¹ We do not mean to imply that there is any close etymological relation between these two uses of the term.

rough climate of a worldly life would either stunt or kill. Her first thought is for the multitudes of average humanity, who are not, and cannot be, in intelligent sympathy with many of the commands she lays upon them. They are but as children in religious matters—however cultivated they may chance to be in other concerns. From such souls God requires faith, and obedience to the commandments—a due, which, in certain rare crises, may mean heroism and martyrdom; but He does not expect of them that refinement of sanctity, that sustained attention to divine things, which depends so largely on one's natural cast of mind and disposition; and may even be found where the martyr's temper is altogether wanting. We recognize that there is certain serviceable, fustian, every-day piety, where, together with a great deal of spiritual coarseness, insensibility to venial sin and imperfection, there exists a firm faith that would go cheerfully to the stake rather than deny God, or offend Him in any grave point that might be considered a *casus belli*. And on the other hand a certain nicety of ethical discernment and delicacy of devotion, an anxiety about points of perfection is a guarantee rather of the quality of one's piety than of its depth or strength. The saint is usually one whose piety excels both in quality and strength; the martyr is often enough a man of many imperfections and sins, veiling an unsuspected, deep-reaching faith. The day of persecution has ever been a day of revelation in this respect—a day when the seemingly perfect have been scattered like chaff before the wind, while the once thoughtless and careless have stood stubborn before the blast.

Protestantism of the Calvinistic or Puritan type shows little consciousness of the distinction we are insisting upon. It is disposed to draw a hard-and-fast line between the "converted" and the reprobate. Those who are not religious-minded, or who do not take a serious turn, are scarcely recognized as "saved" although they may not be convinced of any very flagrant or definite breach of the divine law. Their morality or their "good works" go for little if they do not experience that sense of goodness, or of being saved, which is called faith. Much stress is laid on "feeling good" and little value allowed to what we might call an unsympathetic and grudging keeping of God's law—however much more it may cost, from the very fact that it is in some way unsympathetic, and against the grain. The service of fear and reverence, which Catholicism regards as the

basis and back-bone of love, is held to be abject and unworthy—almost sinful.

Hence it befalls that no place is found in the Protestant heaven for the great majority of ordinary people who do not feel a bit good or religious, who rather dislike going to church and keeping the commandments and yet who keep them all the same, because they believe in God and fear His judgments and honour His law, and even love Him in the solid undemonstrative way in which a naughty and troublesome child loves its parents.

That such a character as Madge Riversdale should cover a small, firm core of faith and fear under a cortex of worldliness and frivolity; that religion should have such a hold on one so entirely irreligious by nature, is something quite inconceivable to a mind like, let us say, Mrs. Humphrey Ward's; and yet absolutely intelligible to the ordinary Catholic.

The Church to us, is not what it is to the Protestant—a sort of pasture land in which we are at liberty to browse if we are piously disposed. It is not merely a convenient environment for the development of the religious faculty. She stands to us in the relation of shepherd, with a more than parental authority to feed and train our souls through infancy to maturity; that is, from the time when we do not know or like what is good for us, to the time when we begin to appreciate and spontaneously follow her directions. Just then as a child, however naturally recalcitrant and ill-disposed, retains a certain fundamental goodness and root of recovery so long as it acknowledges and obeys the authority of its father and mother; so the ordinary unreligious Catholic, who has been brought up to believe in the divine authority of the Church, finds therein all the protection that obedience offers to those who are incapable of self-government.

"In Madge's eyes the woman who married an innocent divorcee was no more than his mistress." Had Madge been a pious Protestant she naturally might have examined the question of divorce on its own merits; she might have weighed the pros and cons of the problem; she might have consulted God in prayer, and have listened to this clergyman on one side; and to that, on the other: but eventually she would have been thrown upon herself; she would have had no one whose decision she was bound to obey. But wild and lawless as she is, yet being a Catholic there is one voice on earth which she fears to disbelieve or disobey. Looked at even

from a human standpoint, the consensus of a world-wide, ancient, organized society like the Roman Church cannot but exert a powerful pressure on the minds of its individual members. It would need no ordinary rebellion of the will for a thoughtless girl to shake her mind so free of that influence as to live happily in the state of revolt. But where in addition to this the Church is viewed as speaking in the name of God, and as so representing Him on earth that her ban or blessing is inseparable from His, it is obvious that such a belief in her claims will give her a power for good over the unreligious majority analogous to that possessed by a parent over an untrained child—a power, that is, of discipline and external motive which serves to supplement or supply for the present defect of internal motive.

Thus it is that the Church reckons among her obedient children thousands of very imperfect and non-religious people for whom Protestantism can find no place among the elect.

Again, the solid faith of men with so little intellectual or emotional interest in religion as Squire Riversdale or Marmaduke Lemarchant is something very puzzling to the Protestant critic who, for the reasons just insisted on, can have nothing corresponding to it in his own experience. It is a psychological state which his own religious system takes no account of. Where there is no intermediating Church, the soul is either in direct and mystical union with God or else wholly estranged and indifferent. A man is either serious and religious-minded, or he is nothing. Like an untutored child, if he is not naturally good, there is no one to make him so. But when the Church is acknowledged as our tutor under God, as empowered by Him to lead us to Him; a middle condition is found of those who are not naturally disposed to religion, and yet who are submissive to that divine authority whose office it is to shape their souls to better sympathies.

Riversdale is a far truer type of the Catholic country squire of the old school than the somewhat morbid and impossible Helbeck of Bannisdale. With her preconceived notions, Mrs. Humphrey Ward could not imagine any alternative between 'religious' and 'irreligious' in the Puritan sense. If Helbeck was to be a good Catholic at all he must of necessity be fanatically devoted to the propagation of the faith and offer his fortune and energies to the service of an unscrupulous clergy only too ready to play upon his credulous enthusiasm. His is represented as

being naturally a religious and mystical soul, but blighted and narrowed through the influence of Catholicism. We are made to feel that the only thing the matter with him is his creed—"all those stifling notions of sin, penance, absolution, direction, as they were conventionalized in Catholic practice and chattered about by stupid and mindless people."

On the other hand, in Squire Riversdale and Marmaduke Lemarchant there is by nature nothing but healthy humanity, no mystic or religious strain whatever; they are not semi-ecclesiastics like Helbeck; and yet we feel that their prosaic lives are governed, restrained, and rectified by a deep-rooted faith in the authority of the Catholic Church. "The qualities most obvious are not those of the mystic, but of the manly out-of-door sportsman who may seem to be nothing more than a bluff Englishman who rides to the hounds and does his ordinary duties. Yet one of these red-coated cavaliers would, I have not the least doubt, if occasion called for it, show himself capable of the very highest heroism. Men of action, I should say, and not of reflection—a race of few words but of brave deeds."

It was just men of this unromantic type, men of solid but unostentatious faith, given wholly to the business of this life save for one sovereign secret reserve, who in time of persecution stood fast "ready any day to be martyred for the faith and to regard it as the performance of a simple duty and nothing to boast of." And if there is in the type a certain narrowness of sympathy and lack of intelligent interest which offends us, we may ask whether, with our human limitations, narrowness is not to some extent the price we pay for strength; whether where decision of judgment and energy of action is demanded, as in times of persecution, width of view and multiplicity of sympathies may not be a source of weakness. Contrast, for example, the character of Mark Fieldes with that of Marmaduke Lemarchant, and it will be clear that the strength and straightness of the latter is closely associated with the absence of that versatility of intellect and affection which make the former a more interesting but far less lovable and estimable personality. To see all sides and issues of a question, is a speculative, but not always a practical advantage; to have many diversified tastes and affections helps to enlarge our sympathies, but not to concentrate our energies.

Of course great minds and strong hearts can afford to be comprehensive without loss of depth and intensity; but our

present interest is with ordinary mortals and average powers. A man who has all his life unreflectingly adopted the traditional principle that death is preferable to dishonour, that a lie is essentially dishonourable, will be far more likely to die for the truth, than one who has philosophized much about honour and veracity ; and whose resolution is enfeebled by the consciousness of the weak and flimsy support which theory lends to these healthy and universally received maxims. And similarly those who have received the faith by tradition, who for years have assumed it in their daily conduct as a matter of course, in whom therefore it has become an ingrained psychological habit, who hold it, in what might be condemned as a narrow, unintellectual fashion, are just the very people who will fight and die for it, when its more cultivated and reflective professors waver, temporize, and fall away. Taking human nature as it is, who can doubt but that this is the way in which the majority are intended to hold their religious, moral, philosophical, and political convictions ; that reflex thought is, must, and ought to be confined to a small minority whose function is slowly to shape and correct that great body of public doctrine by which the beliefs of the multitude are ruled ? We do not mean to say that such prosaic "narrowness" as we speak of, is essential to strength ; but only that a habit of theoretical speculation and a continual cultivation of delicate sensibility is a source of enervation which needs some compensating corrective. This corrective is found in the exalted idealism which characterizes the great saints and reformers, such as Augustine or Francis, or Teresa, or Ignatius—souls at once mystical and energetically practical to the highest degree. It is something of this temper which is parodied in Alan Helbeck. But the Church's mission is not merely to those rare souls whose sympathy with her own mind and will is intelligent and spontaneous ; but at least as much to the multitudes who have to be guided more or less blindly by obedience to tradition and authority, or else let wander as sheep having no shepherd.

These considerations explain why *One Poor Scruple* seems to us so far truer a presentment of Catholic life than *Helbeck of Bannisdale*—the difference lying in the incommunicable advantage which an insider possesses over an outsider in understanding the spirit and principles by which the members of any social body are governed. Of all religions, Catholicism which represents the accumulated results of two

thousand years' world-wide experience of human nature applied to the principles of the gospel, is least likely to be comprehended by an outsider, however observant and fair-minded.

To those for whom the lawfulness of remarriage for an innocent divorcee is, like the rest of their religious beliefs, a matter of opinion, the scruple of a character like Madge Riversdale is unthinkable and incredible. Such women do not trouble their heads about theological points; still less, make heroic sacrifices for their private and peculiar convictions. But those for whom the Church is a definite concrete reality—almost a person—governing and teaching with divine authority, will easily understand the firm grip she can and does exert on those who have no other internal principle of restraint; who would shake themselves free if they dared. Let those who despise the results of such a constraint be consistent and abolish all parental and tutorial control; all educative government of whatsoever description; nay, the imperious restraint of conscience itself, which is often obeyed but grudgingly.

While some features of this portrait of Catholic life are common to all its phases, others are peculiar to the aspect it presents in England, where Catholics being a small and weak minority are, so to say, self-conscious in their faith—continually aware that they are not as the rest of men; disposed therefore to be apologetic or aggressive or defensive. Again, the circumstance of their long exclusion from the social and intellectual life of their country is accountable for other undesirable peculiarities which Mrs. Wilfrid Ward sees no reason to spare.

The chief blemish in the book is the skilful but over-elaborated analysis of feminine jealousy, paltriness, and meanness. This is not a theme which is either pleasant or helpful, and is hardly worthy of the authoress' ability and general tone.

We have not, however, attempted anything like a literary estimate of this interesting, altogether readable work, but have only endeavoured to draw attention to an important point, which, whether intentionally or unintentionally, it illustrates very admirably.

G. TYRRELL.

Ideals of Charity.

THE Protestant ideal of philanthropy has superseded in England the Catholic ideal of charity. Catholics themselves are sometimes misled into adopting a point of view which has never been in complete accord with the teachings of the Church. It is, perhaps, temerarious to generalize on the subject, but, as I understand it, the Protestant ideal of charity is to take care, in the first instance, of a man's body, of his material interests, and then, if possible, to throw in a word for his soul. If this word can be thrown in effectually the Protestant rejoices; if, however, circumstances point to the inadvisability of referring to the soul at all, the Protestant is still content, feeling that he has done the main thing in providing material assistance. And certainly no one would wish him to have withheld the proffered cup of water. Yet the Catholic position, I take it, is somewhat different. In England there is this growing tendency to separate religion and philanthropy—already in many people's minds there is no necessary connection between the two—for Catholics it is essential they should go hand in hand. The success of our charitable labours is marked by the extent to which, through them, we bring the broad truths of Christianity to bear directly on the practical affairs of life. Our efforts must be towards permeating the world with the Christian spirit. Nothing short of this can satisfy us. Nothing short of it is really worth striving after. If we are obliged to admit that the ultimate result of all our endeavours has not been to bring man nearer to God, then to us, as Catholics, our work has been laid on the wrong lines, and our labours have been fruitless.

The problem in its practical application would be simple enough were it not that human life cannot be divided into compartments, and that it is impossible to draw a hard and fast line between a man's material and moral wants. In the case of real destitution, for instance, it is very rare that some amelioration in his moral being does not follow on a man's improved material

fortunes. It is undeniable that a certain measure—albeit a modest one—of material comfort is an essential condition of morality. If a man is to respect his neighbours' property he must at least not be in imminent danger of starving himself. If he is to fulfil certain religious obligations, some leisure must be allowed him for the purpose. And therefore all moral effort which tends to secure to mankind certain elementary human rights should be aided and welcomed by all, of whatever creed, who have the religious welfare of a nation at heart. Hence, in the early stages of their journey, the paths of the Catholic and the Protestant philanthropist or social reformer frequently lie side by side. But the point of separation is soon reached, and once passed, the paths diverge ever more widely.

If, on the one hand, there is a tendency among English Catholics to accept the philanthropic ideals of the Protestant majority as our own, and to assume, perhaps too readily, that because a method of work is serviceable to them, it must of necessity be serviceable to us, in Catholic countries there has been frequently a danger of running to the opposite extreme: of neglecting material conditions as a means of attaining to spiritual ends. In Catholic countries for a work to be not distinctly religious in aim generally means that in its influence it is anti-religious. Hence purely philanthropic undertakings with no avowed object save the prevention of material suffering, have become suspect in the eyes of many. It has been assumed too hastily that good works without the faith are entirely worthless, and I have known the word philanthropic used by eminently pious persons almost as an opprobrious epithet. Charity, both in the sense of giving alms and of personal service, has never been lacking among Catholics, but social reform, whether economic, industrial, or political, has been too often ignored, even by those who had the welfare of the people closely at heart. The whole of the Christian democratic movement on the Continent is based on this fact. It has inaugurated a wider and truer conception of the relation of Christian effort towards the material conditions of modern existence. It has thrown down the somewhat narrow limits within which active charity was in the habit of confining itself, and it has brought to the task an invigorating love of justice, and a renewed faith in the potency of the Christian ideal. Hence, in Belgium, in Germany, even in France, an upgrowth of Catholic *œuvres* on lines undreamt of by a past generation:

workmen's clubs and hostels, mutual aid societies, co-operative societies, *syndicats professionnels*, and many more, which all bear witness to the intimate relation that exists between the spiritual and material welfare of human society. But—and here comes in the profound difference between Catholic and non-Catholic social reformers—these things, good as they are in themselves, are never regarded as sufficient in themselves. They are the material means towards a spiritual end; they are useful stepping-stones towards a more ideal organization of the human family than exists to-day. In his *Magna Moralia*, Mr. Coventry Patmore records that a Saint is one who does everything that any other decent person may do, only somewhat better and with a totally different motive. Perhaps, without irreverence, we may apply the same distinction to Catholic and non-Catholic social effort. To the superficial observer there may be little to choose between them, but the more deeply we probe into them the more irreconcilable their ultimate aims are seen to be.

While active endeavours are being made by Catholic philanthropists in many quarters to improve the industrial position of the working classes generally, it has been left to a Jesuit Father at Brussels to inaugurate a work on similar lines for the special benefit of women-workers. The factory girls and sempstresses of the Belgian capital excited his warm commiseration. They are for the most part overworked and underpaid, and the law as yet has done scarcely anything for their protection. "Sunday-closing" for factories and workshops is one of the reforms for which the Catholic democratic party is still clamouring, and until it is enforced by law women-workers are among the chief sufferers. Not only are they frequently obliged to work on Sundays, but a dressmaker may legally compel her hands to sit up all night, keeping them awake with black coffee, in order to finish a costume for some fashionable customer who has delayed ordering it until the very last minute. Or, worse still, their tasks completed some time after midnight, these mere girls are turned out to find their way home on foot as best they can at an hour when no respectable woman is seen alone in the streets. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that many fall away from their religious duties, and that they are painfully ignorant of all that might make their lives brighter and happier and better.

The Père van Langermeersch felt from the outset that industrial and moral reform must go hand in hand. He

realized that the first step was to win the confidence of these girls by befriending them in a substantial way, in order subsequently to have the right to appeal to their consciences. With this object in view he founded, some six years ago, the "Ligue des Femmes Chrétiennes," a society of ladies pledged to active work on behalf of their poorer sisters. The League has for its aim the material and moral improvement of working-women of all trades by the foundation of a series of *œuvres* specially designed to meet their wants. It is not an almsgiving society: on the contrary, one of its main objects is to teach the working classes to dispense with charity, even in times of sickness, by an intelligent use of the economic advantages that the League is able to bring within their reach. It teaches the value of self-help and co-operation, and it instils a spirit of sisterly *camaraderie* and social obligation one towards the other.

It required nothing less than the zeal of an apostle to inaugurate so apparently hopeless a task. For, in the first instance, the Père van Langermeersch found himself face to face with a double difficulty. He had not only to persuade and instruct those whom he wished to benefit, but he had to persuade and instruct his *femmes chrétiennes* as well. He had to disarm suspicion, to overcome prejudice, both on one side and on the other. He had first to find his ladies, and then to educate them in a new conception of Catholic social work, in a realization of the rich spiritual harvest that awaited their efforts if only they were directed into the proper channel. He had to persuade women who had hitherto been convinced that by regular almsgiving and by devoting occasional hours to a fancy sale or to making clothes for the poor, they were performing the sum total of their obligations, to study economic questions, to master the principles of sick-insurance, and to realize the saving grace that lies hidden in co-operation. And all this in the face of not a little scoffing, and of the serious opposition of many well-meaning but old-fashioned persons. It is greatly to the credit of aristocratic society in Brussels that so many of its members answered to the appeal of the Jesuit Father. The great majority came from the ranks of the *Enfants de Marie*, affiliated to the nuns of the Sacred Heart, and they had at their head from the first the Comtesse de Flandre, the wife of the King's brother, and the mother of the heir-presumptive to the throne. The Comtesse de Flandre in Belgium is all that the Duchess of Teck used to be in England; she is foremost in every good work, and

her cordial interest in the new experiment went a long way towards smoothing down opposition in aristocratic quarters.

When the Père van Langermeersch had found—and to a certain extent trained—his workers, he and they went in search of the work-girls of Brussels. The girls at first were shy, proud, and suspicious; they scented mischief behind this sudden interest in their welfare, and they put no faith in the golden prospects that were held out to them. But by hook and by crook the ladies collected their little audiences in chapel or club-room, and then, week by week, the Father would hold forth to them, teaching, explaining, exhorting, repeating the same thing time after time with unwearied patience, until it had penetrated their slow Flemish brains, adopting every device to rouse the indifference and win the sympathies of his hearers. One of his principles is that you must make people thoroughly understand what you want to do for them, and what you expect of them in return. He aims, not at a mere submissive acquiescence, but at an active and intelligent participation. And slowly, bit by bit, the good seed began to bear fruit. The eloquence, the patience, the obvious sincerity of the priest, the zeal and sympathy of the ladies, won the day over ignorance and distrust. Yet, in spite of all endeavours, it proved impossible to carry out the original scheme without some modification. The idea of the Père van Langermeersch had been to begin by forming trade corporations for needle-women on the system which was first put into practice for men by M. Harmel at Val-des-Bois. These so-called corporations are practically identical on their economic side with our English trades-unions, but they also combine certain features of our friendly societies, and are run on a distinctly religious basis. The members of each trade—dressmakers, milliners, corset-makers, lace-makers, and so on—would each have had their special section, and all would have been united in one general trade society which would have been the kernel of the whole work, and from which various religious and philanthropic developments would have branched out. On its material and industrial side, the aim of such a corporation would be: (1) Sunday rest; (2) increased salaries; (3) improved sanitation in workshops. Nothing more excellent in theory could be devised for raising the industrial status of an over-worked and underpaid class of workers. Unfortunately, it soon became evident in practice that, to begin with the trades-union idea, was to begin with the most difficult part of the work. It

proved almost impossible to make the girls understand the power of combination, and the practical benefits which with a little patience and self-denial they could hope to attain. The difficulty is not one in any way peculiar to Belgium. It exists quite as strongly in England, where, as every one who has tried it will admit, the work of organizing a women's trades-union is one of the most laborious imaginable. On the other hand, certain specific developments of the work organized by the League, such as the *Patronage* and the mutual aid societies, with their provision against sickness, did appeal from the first with a certain force to the untaught female mind. Hence, by degrees, a change was introduced into the order of procedure, and the participation of a worker in the various benefits conferred was no longer made dependent, as at first, on her being a member of her trade corporation. So, too, the sick-insurance, which it was intended to throw open to all members of the corporation, has been erected into a distinct organization. It is not that the Père van Langermeersch has in any way deflected from his original purpose. He is still fully persuaded that industrial corporations, permeated by a Christian spirit, present the most effectual form of industrial organization. But he has realized that the preliminary work of ploughing and sowing cannot be hurried if the ultimate harvest is to be an abundant one; that women are exceedingly slow to grasp economic truths, and that it is useless to attempt to carry a social reform without the assistance of an educated, sympathetic public opinion. The advantages of trade corporations are still urged on all occasions, and meanwhile the successful work that is being done through the mutual aid societies, and still more the co-operative society, and the intelligent and altruistic spirit which is being fostered on all sides by the League, are the best possible preparation towards a more complete organization.

Perhaps the most practically successful of all the works of the League are the sick insurance societies known as "*Mutualités*." Of these there are now three in active operation, with a total membership of over 1,200. The "*Mutualité St. Joseph*" is specially intended for sempstresses and work-girls, that of St. Anne for the factory-girls of the suburbs—a class particularly difficult to get hold of—and the third, that of St. Antony, for the district of Molenbeek. The regulations for all three are practically identical. Every healthy and respectable woman is eligible between the ages of fifteen and

forty-five, girls and widows paying a monthly subscription of sevenpence half-penny (75 cent.), with an entrance fee according to age, and married women a subscription of tenpence (1 fr.), and an entrance fee of four shillings. In return for this the members all receive medical attendance and medicine gratis in times of sickness, together with sick-pay to the amount of tenpence a day for the first three months, and sevenpence half-penny a day for the following three. In addition to this, the married women receive at their confinements a baby's outfit and the services of a midwife gratis, with sick-pay to the amount of £1. Each society meets once a month, on a Sunday afternoon, when subscriptions can be paid, and the lady-president reads her monthly report. Advantage is taken of these reunions to develop a healthy interest in the progress of the society, and frequently the Père van Langermeersch himself attends and gives one of his stirring addresses on some practical topic. The useful lesson in thrift and self-help which the societies inculcate is further emphasized by the fact that they are affiliated to the Government savings-banks, which practically establish a system of old age pensions, by doubling the sums paid in by any depositor. Every one who knows from personal experience how difficult it is for women to put by for the future, will appreciate the very admirable work that the "*Ligue des Femmes Chrétiennes*" is doing in this direction. The Comtesse Nicaise, who is not only president of the "*Mutualité St. Anne*," but also secretary to the League itself, assured me that this section of their work was prospering more and more, and that the women began to show most praiseworthy eagerness to share in its benefits. It must be admitted, on the economic side, that the subscriptions of members barely cover the expenditure, and that the balance has to be established by a small yearly donation from the funds of the League.

Another economic feature which required a great deal of preliminary canvassing to set on foot, is the co-operative drapery stores, known as the "*Société coopérative de l'Aiguille*," in which the work-women hold shares. Now, after a somewhat struggling existence of five years, it can claim to be established on a sound financial basis, although its annual turnover is not as yet very extensive. The sales last year amounted to £1,200, on which a net profit was realized of £136, to be divided between the shareholders and the purchasers. Thus it is a very real pecuniary benefit for work-women to deal

with their own shop, but it has been very hard work to make them appreciate the fact. With the co-operative society, as with the *mutualités*, every effort is made to draw the fullest educational advantages from the scheme. I had the pleasure when I was in Brussels last month of being present at the annual business meeting. The room was crowded with shareholders, and I was much struck, not only by the exceedingly businesslike way in which the lady-president managed the meeting and grappled with the financial details of the situation, but by the intelligent interest in the proceedings displayed by all present. It was clear that the majority at least of the women had fully entered into the spirit of the movement.

I have not space to do more than touch on the remaining good works initiated by the League. At Cureghem, a working class district of Brussels, there is a large *patronage* or club for women and girls, which is open every Sunday, and where gatherings of all kinds are held. Some 800 members make constant use of the spacious premises. Here, too, is the *École Ménagère*, with classes for cooking, washing, sewing, and mending, conducted on the system which has made the Belgian domestic schools a model for all Europe. The classes, which are specially intended for factory-girls, are held on Sundays and Mondays, the latter being a slack day in many trades in Belgium. An employment bureau, and a system of free loans to shareholders in the co-operative society who may find themselves in temporary need, have also proved effectual means of help.

But it is time I should say something of the spiritual side of the work. This centres round the "Œuvre des Retraites," or system of retreats. Through its various branches the members of the League are now in personal touch with from two thousand to three thousand women and girls of the working classes, and from among these a party of forty-five is made up almost every month for a three days' retreat. These are held at Watermael, in the environs of Brussels, in the convent of the Sisters of Perpetual Adoration. The party makes an early start from town on Sunday morning, and the retreat closes on the Tuesday with a General Communion. The nuns have placed large rooms and dormitories at the disposal of the retreatants; there are three instructions a day and the recreations are spent in the garden, the retreatants being under the personal care of the Marquise de Chasteleir, who invariably accompanies

the parties. There is no difficulty in making up the full number; the women are delighted to go, if only they can be spared from their homes and their work. During the first year that the retreats were organized some five hundred took part in them. It is the Père van Langermeersch himself who, as a rule, gives the instructions, and he assured me the spiritual good done by the retreats was incalculable. It was, he found, the one and only way in which large numbers could be permanently influenced and got hold of, and kept faithful to their religious duties. He said the conduct of the women was exemplary, their fervour most encouraging. All the retreatants undertake to make a monthly Communion in future. Mass is said for them at an early hour on a fixed Sunday in the month, usually at some conveniently situated convent chapel, the Père van Langermeersch gives them a short instruction, and they are all entertained to breakfast afterwards.

It is by these retreats and monthly Communions that the real value of the work of the "*Ligue des Femmes Chrétiennes*" must be measured. These are the definite palpable results with which it must be credited. Brussels is scarcely less socialist than many of the industrial cities of Belgium; everywhere large masses of the population are living in practical infidelity, and the question of the hour is how are the inroads of an atheistic socialism to be stopped, how are the disaffected children of the Church to be brought back to their allegiance? With his "*Ligue des Femmes Chrétiennes*" the Père van Langermeersch may claim, I think, to have supplied one answer at least to the question. His way is certainly a good way. It postulates on the side of the workers a goodly fund of zeal and intelligence and self-sacrifice, but it reaps a harvest in proportion to its labours. Many of its features are to be found in a detached form among us in England. The merit of the League lies in the completeness of the scheme of social regeneration, in the energy with which the work is carried through to the end. It does not rest content with half measures, with scrappy results. But above all the League owes its success to the fact that it is frankly, resolutely Catholic, pursuing, without faltering, an avowedly religious aim. It is just here, I think, that its example is so valuable. I should like, for instance, to see its system of short retreats and monthly reunions added on to the work of the Catholic Social Union as the spiritual goal towards which the members of the Union should strive. Could not some

convent be found in the suburbs of London to provide the necessary accommodation? Fed by the social clubs all over London, it ought surely to be possible to collect little parties of from twenty to thirty women at a time. The retreats, being intended for hard-working persons, should be made into periods of rest and of sitting out of doors, as well as of prayer and instruction. A somewhat similar work is already being done, and with most happy results, by the Dames du Cénacle at Manchester, but were they assisted by some outside organization it is clear that their good work could take on far wider proportions.

Clubs, both for men and women of the working classes, exist in plenty in Belgium, but it is recognized on all sides that they are useful only as a first step. They should be regarded as a means, not as an end, and unless they pave the way towards solid educational or religious work, and towards definite spiritual results, they are hardly worth maintaining at a large expenditure of time and money. Perhaps because clubs are a recognized feature of non-Catholic work, we have accepted it as an incontrovertible truth that a popular club, in itself, must be an excellent thing, even when, as too frequently happens, its popularity is entirely dependent on a limitless supply of varied entertainments, provided at the expense of the promoters. Yet much good seed having been sown, partly by means of these very clubs, the time has surely come when Catholic social work might take on itself a wider development. And I would urge on all concerned to look abroad for their models, rather than to our Protestant societies at home. The way of the "*Ligue des Femmes Chrétiennes*" is, I feel sure, the more Catholic way, and I have described its methods of work somewhat at length in the hope that they may suggest useful possibilities to those who are devoting their lives to the great problem of how best to influence for good our Catholic poor.

VIRGINIA M. CRAWFORD.

Dr. Rivington on the Council of Ephesus.

THREE years have elapsed since the publication of Dr. Rivington's *Primitive Church and the See of Peter*. It was a singularly able exposition of historical argument for the Papal Supremacy, and set before English readers a mass of testimony to the early recognition of Papal claims of which adverse writers, to judge from their books, appeared to be totally unaware. The work attracted some attention, and as a consequence had to encounter a good deal of sharp criticism, especially from Canon Bright, in the *Church Quarterly Review*. It passed, however, practically unscathed through this fire, and has wrought conviction, we are happy to know, in many minds. It is satisfactory, therefore, that its author has seen his way to bring out a new and revised edition, in which the objections of his critics are duly examined, and his own argument is rendered still more effective by a greater fulness of detail.

What was previously contained in one volume is now to be expanded into two separate works, of which the one which has just appeared, entitled the *Roman Primacy*,¹ is concerned with the matter which in the *Primitive Church and the See of Peter* formed the subject of the three last chapters. This selection is very wise. Any one who is earnestly debating the claims of the Catholic Church, however much impressed by other and easier arguments in its support, must necessarily lay stress on the appeal to history, and if he has the qualifications, desire to pursue it carefully. Nor can we regret that it should be so. On the contrary, it is just what we desire, provided only that the inquiry be governed by a sound method. Such a method the Rev. A. C. Headlam has defined in the following terms, which Dr. Rivington quotes from an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* :

¹ *The Roman Primacy* (A.D. 430—451). By the Rev. Luke Rivington, D.D. London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899. 6s.

One method may be suggested as a wise one to pursue, that of advancing from the known to the unknown. The great advance in the study of Roman constitutional history has been made by working back from the known and developed constitutions of the later republican and imperial times to the earlier periods. In a similar way the only true method for the study of Church history is to start from the developed constitution and work back to the earlier period.

The reason for thus working backward from the later to the earlier age, instead of forwards from the earlier to the later, is clear as soon as one reflects. Not only is the secret of what was potential in the germs revealed by the more developed organs and functions of adult or adolescent institutions, but the later periods are as a matter of fact illustrated, both in ecclesiastical and secular history, by a fulness of documentary evidence which in earlier periods is almost entirely wanting.

If, however, the appeal to history is to be conducted by this method as regards the question of Papal claims, the period of twenty-one years which Dr. Rivington selects for his present volume is, though so short, the ideal period to examine. It is a period which exhibits, as he reminds us, the Church's action at a time when she was passing through the most serious crisis of her existence, and required to exert all her God-given powers for the preservation in its purity of one of her two most fundamental doctrines, the doctrine of the Incarnation. This crisis had indeed begun much earlier, and all the first General Councils were concerned with it. But the Acts of the Councils of Nicæa (325) and Constantinople (381) are not extant, and were probably never recorded. We have the text of their Canons, but for all else concerning them must be contented with a few gleanings from the writings of contemporaries. Of the proceedings at Ephesus and Chalcedon, on the other hand, and of all that preceded and followed them, we have a great wealth of information—as may be seen at once from a reference to Labbe's or Mansi's *Councils*. Since, then, these two Councils both lie within the twenty-one years whose history Dr. Rivington records, the reader is given the opportunity of studying the very earliest full account of the working of the Church's *magisterium* on a large scale. And this, it would seem, is not only the mode of investigation which is best in itself, but also that which will meet the wishes of such Anglican inquirers as have been brought up to regard the system prevailing in the age of the first four Councils as indisputably that which our Lord founded.

The question to be considered is whether in the history of these twenty-one years a Papacy resembling the modern Papacy in all its essential features can be found working and recognized, just as it works and is recognized now. In such an inquiry it is evidently important to keep well in view from the outset the true nature of the modern Papacy as understood and acknowledged by its adherents. It is, in fact, over this preliminary question much more than over the facts of ecclesiastical history that our critics are misled. Four points here present themselves as requiring to be borne in mind.

First, in holding that the successors of St. Peter are endowed by our Lord with the supreme power of teaching and ruling in His Church, we are far from contending for a system of "Papal Absolutism." By Absolutism one understands a system of government in which the sovereign recognizes no limit to his authority; no constitution by which he is bound; no precedents or traditions to the preservation of which he need consider himself committed. *Sic volo, sic jubeo* is the sole principle of his government. The Church, on the other hand, has a well-defined constitution, and the Pope understands well that he must respect it. It is a constitution, not of human, but of Divine foundation; but all the more he recognizes that he has no power to touch it. One article in this constitution, the only one which concerns us now, is that the Church must be ruled by Bishops, presiding over allotted dioceses and exercising over their subjects a substantial power. Exceptional circumstances may arise when episcopal rule is as yet impossible, as in some missionary countries; but episcopal rule is, by the Divine constitution of the Church, the normal condition, and the Pope is bound to see that it is so preserved. Nor can it really be said that the Popes have neglected this duty. On the contrary, it is notorious that the Bishops in communion with the See of Rome are just those who stand out in contrast to the Bishops of all separated communities, as prelates endowed with a substantial power of ruling and teaching which the others have not. There is, too, another limitation of Papal power, in view of which Papal government may be held less open to the charge of Absolutism than any other. *Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est* were the words of an early Pope, and they express a principle tenaciously adhered to by the Popes generally. Though holding themselves above all merely ecclesiastical law, in the sense that every supreme

authority is above the laws of its own enactment, they have always held it to be their first duty to be the guardians of the sacred canons, and of the ecclesiastical order thereby established, against all endeavours to override or alter them. Changed conditions have oftentimes at length compelled the substitution of some new arrangements for those inherited from a distant past. But invariably, in such cases, the charge to which the Popes have laid themselves open, has been the charge of over-conservatism, rather than of over-readiness to embrace novelties. *Non possumus* has been their traditional rejoinder to all revolutionary proposals, not only when the essentials of the Church's constitution have been threatened, but even when the attack has been directed against time-honoured institutions confessedly of purely ecclesiastical origin. The result has been that, although the Church has always shown herself a living Church, able to cope with the new exigencies of new times, her children have ever felt themselves singularly secure against those arbitrary changes which are the common incidents of despotic rule.

A second important feature in the Papal system is closely connected with the first. Dr. Rivington does not treat it in his Preface, as he does the question of Absolutism, but he has much about it in the course of his book. According to a prevalent Protestant conception, a Catholic Bishop is expected to have no voice of his own in regard to the matter of Papal decrees; he is to swallow them open-mouthed, and execute them as unintelligently as a machine. According to the true conception, Bishops, though bound to accept the definitions of the Apostolic See, are none the less true judges themselves of the teaching contained in such definitions. They are not like the faithful, whose attitude towards these definitions is that of learners only; they are true judges under our Lord's appointment. How can that be, asks the objector? If they must accept what the Pope teaches them, how can they simultaneously examine and judge of it? The solution of this difficulty may recommend itself more easily to those who believe in the *supremum magisterium*, if not of a Pope, at least of a General Council. In such a Council, when the majority by their votes have determined on a doctrinal definition, and the Council, under their leading, is about to promulgate it, what is the position of those Bishops who have formed the minority? By supposition they are bound to accept the decrees of the Council, when promulgated. Are they in so

doing acting as true judges of the faith, or have they forfeited their right to judge by taking the losing side in the discussions? No one would say the latter, and yet if the former alternative is accepted, these Bishops of the minority are in precisely the same position as Bishops under a Papal system who claim, while necessarily accepting, to be likewise truly judging, the teaching of a Papal definition. But the solution is that their office is not merely to accept blindly what is defined. They must try and penetrate into the reasons of the definition. If, as they believe, the definition is infallible, that only means that, quite apart from the definition, they can be confident of finding conclusive reasons for what is defined. They search for these reasons, then, and, having discovered them, are in a position to judge for themselves how true the definition is, and to expound it to their flocks. Thus, to anticipate the great concrete instance with which the Council of Chalcedon supplies us, the Bishops of the Council first accepted St. Leo's Tome as sound doctrine on the faith of his *magisterium*, and then proceeded to examine for themselves into the truth of its reasonings. The result was that they were led to recognize the force of these reasonings, to see how logically it followed from the doctrine of the two natures in One Person, that each nature remained distinct in the union as much as before, instead of the two being mixed and fused into one. In thus examining and working towards conviction, the Fathers of Chalcedon were only doing what the Fathers of the Vatican were invited to do in reference to the doctrines defined then.

A third important point to observe regards the intervention of the Civil Power in ecclesiastical affairs. At all periods of Church history, kings and civil governors have been prone to usurp powers which do not belong to them. Whenever they so acted it became the duty of the Church authorities to consider whether they should meet the usurpation by protest and resistance, or by submission and compromise. At times the former course has been deemed necessary, and fierce conflicts and persecutions have been the consequence. Naturally, therefore, when submission or compromise was possible without endangering any fundamental principle, this course has been preferred. Moreover, the Church is far from thinking that secular princes, when Catholics, should have no part in the regulation of ecclesiastical matters. It is the duty of all laymen, as well as Churchmen, to aid the Church according to their power and

opportunities, and this duty, in the case of secular sovereigns, constrains them to take an ardent interest not only in the spiritual welfare of their own dominions, but also in that of the Universal Church, and particularly in such important undertakings as General Councils. The Church, on her side, has accordingly been only too glad to meet her kingly sons half way, not merely submitting patiently to their interposition, but even inviting their aid, taking their counsels, and deferring to them as far as possible in respect to the lands over which they reign or the general interests of the Church. In this way the Catholic sovereigns have usually had a considerable say in the General Councils. And accordingly we need not be perplexed by the part played at Chalcedon by the Emperor and his deputies. The Emperor convoked the Council in the sense of bidding the Bishops come to it and facilitating their journeys, and his Counts seem to have presided over it in the sense of taking the presidential chair, regulating the course of the proceedings, and preserving order. It may not have been desirable that they should intervene to that extent, especially that the Emperor rather than the Pope should have sent out the summonses, and his Counts rather than the Legates should, to use a modern phrase, have taken the chair at the meetings. It may not have been desirable, and we may surmise that the orthodox groaned under the Erastian infliction. But the essential point is whether the jurisdiction imparting ecclesiastical validity to the transactions of the Fathers was held to come from a civil or from an ecclesiastical source. And if we find evidence, as we do, that the Pope consented to the Council being held—even if he consented reluctantly, as at Chalcedon he did not—and evidence that the Fathers afterwards sought Papal confirmation of their decrees, we have sufficient proof that in the juridical sense it was the Pope, and no other, who presided, and imparted the needful jurisdiction.

One more point of consequence for the due interpretation of primitive Church history remains to be mentioned. Dr. Rivington does not specifically mention it, but it seems desirable to call attention to it. Allowance has to be made in the past just as it has to be made in the present for a certain unsteadiness of conception and want of theological knowledge on the part of individuals and bodies of men, even ecclesiastics. When such a system as that of the Catholic Church is in possession, its adherents cannot fail to be aware

of its more obvious features, and necessarily accept these along with the system itself. But they are not always equally well-instructed in matters which underlie the surface, or are more obscure, or less thought out, and in their want of theological knowledge they may advocate views and theories which in reality are irreconcilable with the system, thereby becoming inconsistent with themselves. Danger may easily spring from these inconsistencies, and, indeed, it is precisely from this source that heresies and pernicious errors eventually do spring. But it is in human nature that such misapprehensions and inconsistencies should always prevail to some extent among Catholics, and they can be held, for a while at least, in perfect good faith and be reconcilable with the truest Catholic spirit. What is wont to happen is that eventually the question of the consistency of such views with fundamental Catholic principles is raised, and investigation follows, either privately in the mind of those who hold the views, or in connection with some general movement or controversy. Sooner or later, it may be, the Church judging the crisis to be serious, examines and condemns the inconsistent theories, and forbids her children to hold them any longer. It is then that the difference between the Catholic and the un-Catholic spirit has an opportunity of manifesting itself. It is then that the loyal Catholic at once submits himself, and sets to work, under the guidance thus received from authority, to discover where his theories offended against the laws of sound reasoning; whilst others only harden themselves in their intellectual obstinacy, and break away from their allegiance. We may cite as an illustration of what is here referred to, Blessed Thomas More's acknowledgment that at one time he supposed the Papal Supremacy to be only *de jure ecclesiastico*, not *de jure divino*, but on inquiry came to realize that it was otherwise. More striking illustrations may be seen in the history of the Gallican theory of the pre-eminence of a General Council over a Pope, or of Bossuet's ascription of Infallibility to the See of Rome but not to its occupant; or Fenelon's Quietistic theories. Such illustrations, too, may be easily recognized without there being any need of particularizing them, in theories lately current but since prohibited, or of others still current on which the voice of authority has not so far spoken, but the consistency of which with Catholic principles and doctrines is actively controverted. The point on which we have to insist in connection with the appeal to the verdict of past history on the Papal claims, is that

no one is entitled to infer that the Papacy was not sufficiently recognized in those days, merely because by the side of testimonies in its favour which are pronounced and unquestionable, we meet with opinions and theories, with expressions and modes of regarding things, which seem to us, and perhaps are, inconsistent with its claims. It must be acknowledged, however, that in the history of Ephesus and Chalcedon such inconsistencies meet us much more rarely than we might have expected.

Bearing these principles in mind we may now turn to the history of the selected period, and inquire, under Dr. Rivington's guidance, into its verdict on the Papal question. In the present article we shall confine ourselves to the history of the Council of Ephesus. Nestorius had been made Bishop of Constantinople, and he had not been long on the throne before he developed the heretical views to which his name became attached. He held that in Jesus Christ we must distinguish two persons, one divine, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the other human and born of the Virgin Mary. The Incarnation he explained as being not a substantial union (*ἔνωσις*) of two natures in one person, but a moral union or interrelation (*συνάφεια*) of the closest kind between two persons. As a corollary of this view he denied that Mary was the "Mother of God" (*θεοτόκος*). "If any one shall call Mary the mother of God, let him be anathema," he allowed Dorotheus, a Bishop of less degree, to exclaim unrebuked in his presence. Of course it was only the human nature which Jesus received from Mary. But inasmuch as a mother is the mother of a man's entire person, not of that portion only of his personality which she contributed in bringing him forth, she was the Mother of God or the Mother only of a Man, according as her Son was God as well as Man, or Man only.

The exclamation of Dorotheus caused a stir at Constantinople, the faithful with few exceptions staying away from communion lest they should be implicated in the heresy. The news spread too from Constantinople to Alexandria, where it caused a similar excitement, and had necessarily to be dealt with by St. Cyril, then the Archbishop of that city. Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, was not under St. Cyril's rule. How then was Cyril to act in order to put an end to the scandal? We find that he wrote to Pope St. Celestine. After premising that "the ancient custom of the Church requires that such matters should be communicated to the Bishop of Rome," he

gives an account of what Nestorius had said and done, and then adds, "deign therefore to decree what seems right (*τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν*),¹ whether we ought to communicate at all with him, or tell him plainly that no one communicates with one who holds and teaches as he does." This surely is the language of a subject to a superior, and St. Celestine's answer is quite that of a supreme ruler. He trusts that Nestorius may see the error of his way and retract, but in case he should not, he is to "know that he cannot be in communion with us"—that is, with the Universal Church, as several parallel passages prove. Cyril therefore is "to assume the authority of Our See and acting in our stead and with delegated authority to execute a sentence of this kind"—*i.e.*, of excommunication and deposition—"and to provide the Church of Constantinople with a new Bishop." Ten days, however, from the receipt of the Papal admonition are to be allowed him for an opportunity of retracting. St. Celestine finishes by describing this his sentence as "our judgment concerning him, nay, rather, the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ." This letter does not stand alone. Celestine wrote in similar terms to Nestorius himself, and likewise to the clergy of Constantinople and to the Bishops John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavian of Philippi, and Rufus of Thessalonica, of which letters some are extant.

Such is the language of Pope Celestine, quite like that which we should look for from Leo XIII. in a similar crisis; nor can it be explained away by any recourse to the science of understatement, which has led some historians on the other side to describe Cyril's letter to Celestine as a letter written "in very deferential terms," and Celestine's reply merely as giving Cyril "a commission of stringent character," or bidding him "join the authority of the Roman See *to his own*," and "on the part of Celestine as well as for himself," to warn Nestorius "that unless he retracted he would be excluded from the communion of those Churches," viz., Rome and Alexandria. Nor can the conspicuous resemblance between the language of Celestine and that of modern Popes be denied on the mere ground that Celestine, in preparing his reply, called and consulted a synod of neighbouring Bishops, and Cyril in some places calls the directions sent to him "the decision of the Roman Synod." It is inconceivable that a Synod composed of a few Bishops from the neighbourhood

¹ The justice of this translation has been challenged, but *τυπῶν* is the regular form of to decree. (See Dr. Rivington's note to his first chapter.)

of the Eternal City, or happening to be temporarily residing there, should claim authority to depose a Bishop of Constantinople; and on the other hand, Celestine, in his letters, speaks in his own name, and delegates the "authority of his own See," not that of his Synod. It is clear then, as Catholic writers have always maintained, that, if the Papal decision is sometimes ascribed to the Synod instead of to the Pope individually, by the Synod is meant the "Pope in Council," to adopt an English phrase, as distinguished from the Pope speaking in a less formal way. This is a point which Dr. Rivington discusses very fully.

Cyril, after an interval of three months, during which he assembled a Synod of his own, proceeded to execute the sentences of Pope Celestine, and for that purpose sent an embassy of four Bishops to Constantinople. They arrived there in November, 430, and at once delivered their message. In the dearth of documents, we cannot tell what were the immediate results, but before the arrival of the letters of excommunication the Emperor Theodosius, who favoured Nestorius and disliked Cyril, had summoned a council of Bishops, which met at Ephesus in the following spring. Cyril attended and presided. He was the second Bishop in Christendom, but Dr. Rivington offers proof which seems to us decisive that he presided, not in his own right, but in his capacity as holding the place of Celestine. It is only in this sense that we can understand the frequently recurring statements that the Council was presided over by "Celestine and Cyril," for the Papal legates did not arrive till the business of the Council was complete. Nestorius, having solicited the Council, went early to Ephesus, but found all the churches closed to his ministrations, a fact which points to the general acceptance of the Papal excommunication already delivered to him. Still the Fathers of the Council themselves were anxious to give him another chance, and so summoned him to attend. It was Celestine himself, as we learn from his letter of May 7th, who had authorized his being received as a Bishop, and finally dealt with by the Synod. It is futile, therefore, to attempt to discover a disregard of Papal authority in the fact that he was given this further hearing even after the ten days of grace had elapsed. And even if there were not documentary evidence that this was Celestine's wish, we might presume that it was. It is no part of true obedience in the case of a Papal, more than of any other command, that its words should be under-

stood with an excessive literalism. The summoning of the Council, set on foot before the excommunication reached the incriminated man, created a new situation, and seemed to postulate that he should not be denied that further chance of righting himself.

But Nestorius, foreseeing what was in store for him, refused to answer the summons from the Council, and even maltreated the messengers sent to call him. It was necessary, therefore, to proceed against him in his absence. A further difficulty, however, presented itself in the conduct of John, Bishop of Antioch, who, though not far distant from Ephesus, delayed his arrival there, in the evident intention of abstaining from all share in the deposition of his friend. After waiting sixteen days amidst much discomfort, on account of the climate and the accommodation, John at length desiring them to act without him, they proceeded to the act of deposition. The Nicene Creed, and the various letters interchanged between Nestorius and Cyril were first read, and then Celestine's letter "concerning the faith," as it was styled by Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem. This phrase meant clearly that the letter in question was what it professed to be, the *τύπος* which was to guide their procedure, and accordingly its reading was next followed by that of Cyril's letter to Nestorius, executing the Papal sentence which had been delivered to Nestorius at Constantinople. This letter of Cyril's having been pronounced "consonant with" Celestine's letter, was itself approved, and then it only remained for the Fathers of the Synod to pronounce their own similarly consonant sentence. This they presently did, "being compelled," as they expressed it, "both (*ἀπὸ*) by the canons and by (*ἐκ*) the letter of our Most Holy Father and fellow-Bishop, Celestine, the Bishop of the Church of the Romans." "By the canons" meant, as some parallel passages show, the canons which had been satisfied by their three-fold summons of the heretic. What then can the strong phrase "compelled (*ἀναγκάως κατεπευχθέντες*) by the letter of our Most Holy Father Celestine" mean, save that the authority of his command to excommunicate and depose Nestorius was recognized to be binding on their consciences? We put the question, but are fully aware of the replies which have been attempted. We have no space here to discuss them, and must refer the reader to Dr. Rivington's note to his fourth chapter. But they are replies dictated so obviously by the science of understatement that it does not seem likely that they can continue to be maintained by their propounders.

We must pass over the disturbance caused by the arrival of John of Antioch, as soon as the deposition had been pronounced, and his attempt to annul it, and excommunicate Cyril and Memnon, in a Conciliabulum of some thirty Bishops—mostly of ill-repute—an attempt principally based on the ground that the sentence had been pronounced in his own absence and before a hearing had been given to Nestorius—two pleas which cannot have been sincere. We must pass at once to the arrival of three Papal Legates who had been deputed by St. Celestine to assist Cyril at the Council, but had been delayed by a storm on their voyage. Two of them, Arcadius and Projectus were Bishops; the third, Philip, is described as a “priest of the Roman Church,” and, perhaps on this account, more directly represented the Pope and took the lead. The Legates brought with them their instructions, from which Dr. Rivington quotes freely, and which are to the effect that they were to maintain the authority of the Holy See, to judge of the opinions of the Bishops and not to enter into any discussions, and were to take counsel with Cyril on points of difficulty, especially if on their arrival they should find that things were going badly. From a companion letter to the Synod which they brought with them, we also learn that they were to “execute what had already been decreed by (Celestine) to which (he) had no doubt (the Fathers) would give their assent when that which was done was seen to have been decreed for the safety of the Church.” This point, that Celestine had already judged Nestorius, and that the duty of the Synod was to execute his sentence, continually recurs in the *Acta*, and was repeated by Bishop Firmus of Cæsarea on the first appearance of the Legates in the midst of the Fathers. Firmus added that, Nestorius still continuing in his perversity, they had already executed the sentence upon him. On this the Legates congratulated the Fathers for having “joined themselves as holy members to their holy head, for their Blessednesses were not ignorant that the head of the whole faith and of the Apostles is the Blessed Apostle Peter.” They then asked to see the decrees of deposition, having received which, they retired to consider them.

The next day, having first read through the *Acta* given them, they met again in Synod, and, after having first caused these same *Acta* to be read publicly, the Legate Philip proceeded to give Papal confirmation to the conciliar sentence in a speech

commencing with the following impressive assertion of Papal authority :

It is doubtful to none, and has been known to all ages, that the holy and most Blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and the foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the Kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, and that the power of loosing and binding was given him ; who up to this time, and always, lives and exercises judgment in his successors. Therefore our most blessed Father Bishop Celestine, being his successor and holding his place, has sent us to this holy Synod to supply his place.

The other two Legates spoke in the same tone, after which the Synod said : " Since the most pious and God-fearing Bishops and Legates Arcadius and Projectus, and Philip, presbyter and Legate of the Apostolic See, have spoken suitably, it follows that they should make good their promise and by their signature confirm what has been done." The word here translated " suitably " (*ἀκολουθως*), might be not unreasonably translated " canonically," for it means " in due sequence, as the case required." It involved, therefore, a most distinct acceptance of the Legates' words as being only such as their place and circumstances required. And yet the Legates' words sound like an extract from the Vatican Council. We are sometimes told by writers on the other side, that it is true indeed that some early Western writers claimed St. Matt. xvi. 16—18 as referring to the Bishops of Rome, but that no early Eastern writers can be quoted for this interpretation. Yet we have here, on a most solemn occasion, a whole Eastern hierarchy accepting this interpretation as right and proper. But it is not merely for this interpretation of the text that the proceedings at Ephesus, taken in conjunction with what preceded and what followed them, can be cited. The slight outline we have given shows—as it will show still more to those who see it filled up with the striking details which Dr. Rivington has given—that on the first adequately recorded occasion on which the Church was called upon to use her organization for the suppression of heresy, the Bishop of the Apostolic See was already conspicuous as exercising the functions of a Supreme Ruler.

Here then we must stop for the present, but with a cordial recommendation to all interested in the history of Papal Claims,

to study carefully this valuable work on the two early Councils. If we have not quoted from its author more extensively in the foregoing article, it is because it has seemed better to give a simple narrative account of the history, rather than to discuss the abstruse questions of textual interpretation which Canon Bright has raised, and with which in this revised edition Dr. Rivington is so much engaged. These would be without interest to most of our readers, and would indeed be unintelligible to all save those who are thoroughly familiar with the subject. But scholars will find them full of interest, and, we venture to hope, many such will find them as convincing as we do ourselves. In particular we shall look to see what Canon Bright will say to them ; and, above all, what he will have to say to the notes on *τύπος*, on *κατεπειχθέντες*, and—to anticipate—on the Sixth Nicene Canon. As has been said, these notes refer mostly to himself, and we are confident that he will give them a fair as well as a competent consideration. It is of distinct advantage that questions of such theological importance should be sifted thoroughly by a pair of scholars so searching and painstaking as Canon Bright and Dr. Rivington.

S. F. S.

Our Boys.

AMONG the many changes which have come about during the last fifteen years—educational, religious, social—there is one which may be regarded from each of these standpoints, and one, also in the bringing about of which this Review may claim to have taken a prominent part.

It was in July, 1885, that the late Mr. Edward Lucas published in these pages an essay on "The Conversion of England," which, from its outspokenness and the numerous statistics with which its conclusions were supported, at once arrested attention. It was not regarded by all with favour, conflicting as it did with the somewhat Utopian view held by some as to the progress of the Church in England: others, however, and those the most numerous and influential, saw in it a call to development of effort in certain directions which could not be neglected.

The line taken up by Mr. Lucas was emphasized by a pamphlet on "The Loss of Our Children," published by our present Cardinal (then Bishop of Salford) in 1886. Shortly afterwards there appeared in *THE MONTH* a paper called "A Remedy for the Leakage," the initials appended to which—"C. G."—will be easily interpreted as those of one who is now a priest in a midland diocese, where he has carried out with much success many of the views put forward. In May, 1887, the present writer contributed an article on "The Loss of our Boys" to this Review; and as lately as 1895 "A Secular Priest" from the same diocese as "C. G." published here an essay on "The Remedy for the Leakage," in which he warmly commended the work of the Catholic industrial schools.

Leaving the last of the series out of our calculation—for industrial schools are no new agency among us, and deal with a limited class—we may briefly indicate the developments which have taken place since these essays were written, and sometimes as a direct consequence of them. Cardinal Vaughan, before he

left the diocese of Salford, set on foot a "Rescue Society," which his successor is carrying on with excellent results. On his coming to Westminster, His Eminence at once set on foot the Catholic Social Union, of which more will be said later; and his "Crusade for the Children," which formed the subject of the Lenten Pastoral this year, is already setting to work. The late Bishop of Southwark took up similar work with earnestness and enthusiasm; he established for his diocese an "Education Council and Rescue Society," which is at present carried on with much zeal by the Rev. Edward St. John. Both sides of the Thames are thus actively engaged in rescue work; and Liverpool and other dioceses are not behind.

A more definite outcome of the suggestions made in these pages may be found in the Working Boys' Homes. When the paper on "The Loss of our Boys" was written, we had no such Home in London. The Rev. A. W. Clements was moved to take up the work in Westminster, now carried on by the Rev. E. Bans; and shortly afterwards a similar undertaking was set on foot on a more extensive scale in Southwark by the Rev. Edward St. John, and by the Rev. J. Berry in Liverpool. Of the work of these Homes it is not my intention to speak in this paper; suffice it to say that, in addition to the good done at home, a settlement in connection with the Southwark Home has been made in Canada, whence already many lads have attained good employment, and whence most satisfactory results are reported. An object lesson in Catholic rescue work was lately given in the shape of an admirably planned and executed entertainment in the Royal Victoria Hall, by the lads of the Industrial Schools and Working Boys' Homes of the diocese. It was impossible not to feel that those who had been instrumental in rescuing so large a number of lads from almost certain loss of faith, to say nothing of temporal destruction, were doing a great and lasting work for the Catholic Church in this land.

But while we cannot fail to be thankful for what is being done, we must not delude ourselves into the belief that it is in any way adequate to the needs of the case. The number of boys who come under the control of any institution is a mere nothing in comparison with those who leave school every year, and who need "the bridge over the teens" to conduct them safely into the period of full responsibility and settled life. Any one who will take the trouble to notice, in any of our

London missions, the number of boys over school age who attend Mass on Sundays will see at once that the proportion is almost ridiculously small. This is no reflection upon either clergy or teachers, for in instances which might be named the devotion of both is conspicuous. It may be allowed, too, that after a spiritual *wanderjahr* many of the boys will return to their allegiance, though it will be easy to overestimate the number who do this. The fact, however, remains that at a period of peculiar susceptibility to external influences, and after a course of thorough training in religion accompanied by a reception of the sacraments, a very large proportion of our boys leave off going to Mass at the same time that they leave school.

It must be remembered that to this class the weight of home influence, which we are accustomed to regard as all-powerful, is not so much absent as thrown into the wrong scale. While they are at school this influence may, to some extent, be corrected by rules which I have known to be somewhat severely enforced; but when such restraint is withdrawn home environment resumes its sway. It may happen that the only members of a family who attend Mass with anything like regularity are those who are at school; and it is difficult to exaggerate the firmness and resolution required in the boy of thirteen if he wishes to carry out what he knows to be right. Add to the influence of what we can at best call carelessness the various temptations which surround the boy in our largely heathen towns—an expression amply justified by the recent statements of such men as Canon Barnett, of Whitechapel, the Rector of St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, and others—and there is little wonder that the proportion of children at Mass is small.

It is no reflection upon the clergy to say that the influence of the priest in such cases is comparatively limited. Assuming that his other avocations leave him ample time for visiting, and that this particular form of work is congenial to him, it is only too likely that he will fail with the boy as he has failed with the parents. It is, moreover, certain that until our staff of clergy is greatly increased, it will be impossible to devote much time to house-to-house visitation of this kind. In small missions it may be practicable, in large ones it is impossible.

The hope for the future of our boys seems to lie in a great development of the social side of work, following on a complete and thorough recognition and discussion of the needs of the case. These latter have been unflinchingly set forth in the

Cardinal's last Pastoral and other episcopal utterances ; by Father Berry and Mr. Chilton Thomas at Liverpool last year ; by Dr. Barry in his stirring appeal for "a Lay Apostolate," delivered at Archbishop's House two years since, and by others ; but it may be doubted whether even now the ordinary Catholic understands the position. Even now we hear it said that those who devote time and energy to the education or amusement of the poor are in danger of overlooking the spiritual side of things, and that temporal apart from spiritual benefit is worse than useless—an expression to which vigorous exception was taken lately by the Lord Chief Justice. I remember being told by Cardinal Manning that he had been taxed with substituting temperance for religion, and the charge used frequently to be brought against the humbler workers in the former cause. In this, as in so many other ways, the fact that the Catholic Social Union has been so largely taken up by leaders in society who are known also as leaders in religion, has done much to bring about a better understanding of the position ; but it cannot be said even now that there is no danger that Catholic social work may be misunderstood.

The objection was made at the time when Mr. Lucas published his paper, and it has been renewed since, that the statement of our shortcomings would be employed by Protestant controversialists, illogically enough, as an argument against the Church. Such has been the case, and it has been attempted to show from our own statistics that no progress is being made ; just as though the escape of some of the contents of a sack through a hole in the bottom proved that nothing had been added through its mouth ; just as though those who leak from us do so by a process of conversion to some form of Anglicanism or Methodism ; and just as though those who leak from us were not equalled and indeed enormously surpassed by those who leak from other denominations into a similar disregard for religion of any kind.¹ Those who in the first instance published the figures on which these conclusions are based were quite aware of the use to which they would be put, and were not afraid of the result. But the recent utterances of the Anglican

¹ "Last year, the total membership of Wesleyan Methodism was about 440,000. During the twelve years 1886-1897, the losses were 443,000—reckoning only those who had removed or lapsed from membership, and excluding those who were lost by emigration or by death. That is, year by year one member out of every twelve drops out of Methodism ; or once in every twelve years Methodism has to renew its whole force—to grow a new race." (*Sunday Magazine*, 1898, p. 359.)

clergymen already mentioned, do not seem to afford much ground for Protestant self-congratulation. Mr. Hugh Price Hughes is reported to have said that in London alone there are 3,000,000 people as heathen as if they were in the centre of Africa, and the Rev. S. A. Selwyn, at the recent centenary of the Church Missionary Society, spoke of the metropolis as "the most heathen city in the world." With such environment, it is no wonder that our children fall away, exposed as they are besides to numerous temptations in their own immediate surroundings—temptations of a kind of which the respectable Catholic is blissfully ignorant. To any, who know the way in which our poor are housed, the marvel must be, not that so many of our children go astray, but that any remain firm in the practice of their religion.

What, then, is to be done for our boys between—let us say—the ages of 13 and 18? Up to the former age, they are to some extent under supervision; after the latter, they are more or less independent, and are eligible for election to the Catholic men's clubs, which, although in too few numbers, exist in many parts of London. And who is to do the work?

To answer the second question first, it may be said that we have already in existence certain bodies within the scope of whose operations the care of our boys might naturally be expected to come. The Catholic Social Union has already been named, and its reports show that something has been accomplished, and that only the need of more workers prevents more being done. On the south of the Thames, a boys' club (apart from the large club for those of eighteen and upwards) is carried on by the residents at Newman House. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul has in the past done much in the way of what is unfortunately styled "patronage" work; six years ago nearly eight hundred boys were in some way or other under the supervision of the Society, but from last year's Report it would appear that this number has dwindled down to a hundred, and that only one of the thirty-five Conferences in London takes up either "Patronage" or Sunday school work. To some extent it may be supposed that the Society of St. Vincent de Paul has been supplanted in work of this kind by the Catholic Social Union; but this is certainly not the case everywhere. Moreover, there is more than enough for both societies to do—more, indeed, than they can accomplish between them if they put out all their strength. The speech of Lord Ripon, the new President

of the London Council, at the Quarterly Meeting held while this article was passing through the press, is a happy augury of a renewal of activity in the immediate future.

It would appear that Catholics have a right to expect from those who in London take up the work founded by Ozanam, at least the same amount of zeal that is manifested by their brothers in the provinces; but in the annual Reports London cuts a sorry figure by the side of certain provincial towns.

The Catholic Association has devoted itself with much success to the developing of social intercourse among Catholics; and it seems not unreasonable to hope that it may see its way to taking a share in this most important branch of social organization. In the same way it might be possible for the Catholic League of South London, at any rate in some of its branches, to add such work to its various undertakings. If it were possible to organize a meeting to be attended by delegates from all the bodies named, it might be found that, by one or the other of them, work among boys could be undertaken in every part of London. The whole of Catholic Birmingham is planned out under various Committees of its Catholic Association; and although for many reasons the obtaining of a similar result in London would be attended with many and serious difficulties, these are not insuperable, given that combination of zeal and discretion which is essential to the success of any enterprise. One advantage of some such systematic arrangement would be that the withdrawal of one worker would not, as is at present too often the case, result in the discontinuance of the work; even if permanence were not secured—and nothing is more difficult—it would at least be less uncertain than it is at present.

As to what is to be done, something may be learned from what is actually doing, and more from the inspection of the various clubs at work. If I might venture on a few hints, based on a good many years' experience, I would urge in the first place that the Club—I use this name as most convenient—should be carefully distinguished from the Confraternity. The aim in view is of course religious; but it is not wise to spread the net in the sight of the bird. Good boys will join a Confraternity for its own sake, and others will do so as a natural result of the Club's influence; but those whom it is desired to attract will no more join a "religious" Club than they will be enticed by the prospect of wearing "a handsome collar and medal"—an

inducement held out by the "Patronage" Committee of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; this may work well in France, but the London boy would treat it with ribald contempt. I know something of London boys and of what attracts them, but I have never found one who would "begin a good life by a wish for the honour of the collar;" collars of any sort are strange to the class of lads with whom we may hope to have most to do. I have always felt greatly in sympathy with Father St. John in his objection to boys "who have never given their mothers one moment's anxiety," and I agree with him that "if their number showed any signs of increasing, it ought to become a matter for legislation;"¹ but only such boys would wish to obtain the collar and medal, except such as were stimulated by emulation like that of Tom Sawyer for the Catechism prize, and these would, I fear, be as unscrupulous as he was in their modes of obtaining their end.

The Club must be used primarily for recreation pure and simple, but every encouragement should be offered and opportunities should be given to boys who wish to read or to learn. These will always be in the minority, but I think among any large number there will always be a few. And there must be a wise tolerance of a certain amount of occasional disorder; and—dare I say it?—if a "big big d—" should inadvertently find utterance, it might be well to turn a deaf ear at the time, although the matter might be mentioned privately at a suitable opportunity. The public opinion of the boys is extremely strong in matters of this kind, and nothing is more striking than the abandonment inside the Club of certain forcible formulas which are almost necessary features of external conversation. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul takes a different view: "If any Patronage boy use a bad word, he should be immediately suspended, and perhaps expelled"—so runs its Spartan code. That, too, may possibly work well in France, but if it were carried out unflinchingly, the members of our Club would be select rather than numerous.

Considerable attention should be given to out-door games—cricket, for example, which even in London is not altogether impracticable, if funds can be raised for hiring a ground, or if a pitch in one of the parks can be secured. Here is a chance for the Catholic public-school boy to distinguish himself! Failing him, there should be no difficulty in finding one or two young Catholic men who will, at any rate occasionally, sacrifice their

¹ *Report of Sixth Conference of Reformatory Schools, 1894, p. 71.*

Saturday afternoons for the benefit of our poor boys ; Frederick Ozanam would have done it, and his disciples must not lag behind. Gymnastics of all sorts are to be encouraged, including boxing ; and this makes it clear that the management of the Club must not be in the hands of "a pious elderly man," as the well-intentioned rules I have already quoted suggest.

Of all people to look after boys, pious elderly men are the worst, especially if they are of the same station in life. When we first started our boys' club in Southwark, some excellent men volunteered to help. The boys did not appreciate their good intentions, and resented their interference ; and at last an explosion came. I went in after church one Sunday evening, and found the club bereft of boys. "Where are they all ?" I asked. "Just come upstairs," was the reply. I went, and saw a floor strewn with cards and dominoes and draughts, which it was only too evident had been employed as missiles. There had been a conflict of opinion between the men and the lads—so true is it that

Crabbed age and youth
Cannot dwell together—

and the boys had been turned out. One thought struck me—the piano ! I went to it, and to my delight found it was intact. "They haven't damaged the piano," I said, gratefully. One after another the pious elderly men went downstairs, pained beyond words at what they thought my levity, and the club knew them no more. So the boys came back.

If it be constantly borne in mind that our object is to get hold of the boys and to keep them, and that all of us, even the most pious and elderly, have at one time been boys, I think many of the difficulties incidental to the work will disappear. So far, however, I have dealt with the abstract question. I propose now to take a concrete example of work successfully undertaken and accomplished, of a kind which seems capable of considerable extension.

For many years the work of the "Boys' Brigade" has been successfully carried on in many parts of the country. The work originated in Scotland, spread to England, and was largely taken up undenominationally. After a time the Church of England adopted the movement on its own lines for its own members, and we have now two bodies, similar in general organization, numbering in their ranks many thousands of members. It was discovered that, as one of the early pro-

moters of the movement remarked, although if you call your boy a boy—which he is—you may fail to do anything with him, if you put a uniform cap and tunic upon him and call him a soldier—which he is not—you can do pretty much as you please. To Bermondsey belongs the honour of having adopted this organization for Catholic lads, and some months ago the members, at the beginning of their third year of existence, gave a public exhibition in the Drill Hall at that place, which astonished and delighted all who saw it. The smart, manly bearing of the boys, the precision and promptitude of their evolutions, and their general alertness, were most creditable to teacher and taught; and Father Segesser, the priest who has the Brigade in charge, has given me the following particulars of the work, which it may be hoped will be taken up elsewhere.

The Brigade originated in a night school, in which drill formed part of the instruction, and began with a membership of about forty; these were examined by a Volunteer officer before joining. During the second year, drill and night school were held on alternate nights, five nights a week, with an average attendance of twenty-three, the Brigade numbering eighty. French and "the three R's" formed the educational course, and the Brigade became thoroughly established. The age for admission is thirteen, the period at which most of the members leave school; but by a wise arrangement the elder lads actually at school are drilled and prepared for admission when they leave. The uniform is very complete, consisting of cap, trousers, tunic, belt, and haversack; it is possible to obtain the whole of these for 10s., and through the facilities for thrift which are afforded by a penny bank in the school, the boys are themselves, in most instances, able to pay for their outfit. Last August Bank Holiday, by the kindness of a Catholic gentleman, the Brigade, to the number of eighty, was invited to "camp out;" and Father Segesser left the management of the camp, on the second night, to the lads themselves. Everything was conducted with the most perfect order; lights were out at ten; and when the chaplain went to the camp a little later, everything was quiet, save for the challenge by the sentries—"Who goes there?"

This third year, which began about October, the numbers and undertakings have increased. There are now one hundred and thirty in the Brigade, with an average attendance of forty; the educational curriculum has been extended, and now includes, besides the essentials, French, drawing, book-keeping, and

shorthand, as well as drill and ambulance work—in the last of which, judging from the demonstration given at the exhibition referred to, the members have attained remarkable proficiency.

Various examinations are conducted by professionals, but the Brigade is mainly officered by the lads themselves; the sergeant-major, who has obtained certificates and is duly qualified to teach, has risen from the ranks. Discipline is admirably and firmly maintained, but the steady and regular attendance shows that this is an incentive rather than a deterrent. It must not be forgotten that monthly communion is a rule of the Brigade, which, like the rest of the rules, is well observed; and, although total abstinence is not enforced, the large majority of the members are teetotallers.

This is a very brief account of what appears to be a promising new departure in the direction of retaining our boys; and there seems no reason why what is successful at Bermondsey should not answer equally well elsewhere. The experiment is being set on foot at Rotherhithe, and is likely to be taken up on the other side of the river. Father Segesser will gladly supply any further particulars, and is, I believe, prepared to send a duly qualified officer to any place within reasonable distance, for the purpose of establishing a similar brigade. An ounce of fact is worth a hundredweight of theory; and those who wish to see the Brigade at work cannot do better than pay Bermondsey a visit.

Meanwhile, whether in this—which seems to me an ideal method, combining as it does discipline, method, education, and amusement—or in some other way, it behoves us all to do something towards retaining those for whose welfare we are to some extent responsible. Those who can give time and personal help make the best offering of all; but money, though less than is usually supposed, is needed for such work, and some who cannot personally assist can do so through the medium of their purses. But to each one of us the call comes, and none can afford to neglect it.

JAMES BRITTEN.

Authority and Evolution, the Life of Catholic Dogma.

THIS work of P. de la Barre's¹ is valuable as crystallizing and bringing into system most of the tentative ideas on the subject of evolution in dogma which have been put forward of late by Catholic theologians following in the wake of Newman. The author rightly protests against the common innuendo of adverse critics, that this doctrine of development has sprung suddenly into existence to meet the awkward revelations of history touching the contrast between the dogmatic teaching of early and modern Catholicism. Vincent of Lerins is well quoted amongst others, as the most explicit exponent in ancient times of the doctrine of development; for he too is perhaps more generally notorious for his vehement assertion of the conservative principle—seemingly contrary, but really complementary—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. It is only the popularity of evolutionism in our day that makes it more important to insist upon this ancient aspect of theology, and ensures it a better chance of being understood. At other times the principle of immobility and conservation needed emphasis against the unrestrained 'progressivism' of heresy refusing the guidance of those "directive ideas" which make a development legitimate, and which secure identity amid diversity, unity of plan together with expansion of parts. But now that the heterodox historians of dogma are casting the "*quod semper*" principle in her teeth, the Church turns the pages of the *Commonitorium*, and lays an emphatic finger on c. xiii. "Let the religion of souls follow the method of bodies, which, though in the course of years they evolve and unfold their several parts, yet withal abide what they were;" and she claims that, while in substance her doctrine remains unchanged, yet in the lapse of centuries its parts and members

¹ *La Vie du Dogme, Autorité—Évolution*. Par le R. P. de la Barre, S.J. Paris: Lethielleux, 1898.

have been brought out into clearer recognition, and have been more accurately defined.

P. de la Barre's aim is to show how these principles of authority and evolution are mutually complementary in the determination of Catholic dogma.

Speaking widely, the Protestant conception of religion is individualist ; while the Catholic, which is social and collective, finds itself in sympathy rather with Comte than with Rousseau. Comte, J. de Maistre, de Bonald, and Lamennais are adduced as in one way or another upholding the Catholic notion of a "society entrusted with the transmission of a doctrine, with the safe-guarding and promulgation of a certain deposit." They all recognize that a power, therefore a duty, of independent thought is far rarer than individualist philosophy imagines, and that the vast majority of men do, and ought to, rule their minds by a certain floating body of public doctrine in which they have a natural faith. This body of doctrine is slowly formed, shaped, modified, corrected, and increased by the accumulated labours of the few independent thinkers ; and thus there is provided for the multitude a norm of belief which, if fallible, is practically sufficient for each age and country. The idea that each man can and ought to think independently on all subjects has no basis in fact, and leads in practice to intellectual and every other kind of anarchy. Man is a social being in respect to the formation of his mind, no less than in regard to his general development. His mind as well as his body is sterilized by solitude.

Holding society to be altogether natural, and by no means artificial, Comte rightly seeks in its growth for the two principles which are involved in every kind of vitality—a principle of permanence and sameness, and a principle of movement and diversity. It is in authority that this principle of stability is found, whereby the movements of the organism are controlled into agreement with the fundamental idea or plan which its growth develops ; and thus, sameness of end and design prevails, together with extension and diversity of parts.

So far as we confine our attention to society considered as a school for the mind, this governing authority, this body of publicly approved belief, may find voice in many ways. With de Maistre, the Pope of Rome gathered up and gave utterance to the collective sentiment of the faithful in matters of religious doctrine. Comte seemed inclined later in life to arrogate

to himself a quasi-papal function in regard to positivism. De Bonald is so convinced of the incompetence of individual reason that he does not allow that even its accumulated observations and reflections could ever slowly create a public deposit of religious doctrine, but attributes this latter to primitive teaching handed down from father to son, and somewhat damaged in the process. Lamennais, however, credits humanity, taken collectively, with a certain infallibility in guarding the deposit of primitive religion. What all religions agree in, he holds to be true. Christianity supplements and develops this original and universal creed, but in no way sets it aside. It, like every other religion, springs from the common trunk; and is but the most fully developed branch of that tree.

Integrating these scattered truths, these broken lights, which are emphasized, if at times caricatured, in recent philosophies, P. de la Barre finds the transmission of moral, religious, and philosophical ideas determined, first by authority, or the influence of the social body, however vested; and then, by the inherent expansive power of the idea itself.

The members of society being locally and externally separate, some authority is needed to unite them and to bring their minds into concord. On this need Comte and de Maistre insist. De Bonald supplements their theory by insisting on the need of tradition, whereby the collective mind of the past is brought to bear upon that of the present. Obviously enough, both these requirements are met by the Papacy, which gives voice to the collective mind of the present Church built upon the past, and so brings the social influence of the whole Christian body, from the beginning, to bear upon the mind of the individual and to shape its religious beliefs.

But the Church being a supernatural religious society, an element enters in of which philosophy takes no account. It has acquired its deposit of divine truth by revelation, not by human investigation and reflection; it preserves that deposit and interprets it, through human means indeed, but supplemented by divine assistance ensuring infallibility. Even apart from such intervention, the security of guidance offered by such an ancient, world-wide, close-knit organism would be considerable—though it may be fairly held that it is in the very creation and continuance of this religious republic that the hand of God is most felt and the promise of assistance fulfilled. Comte had the idea—or rather borrowed it—but Christ alone effected it.

To the Protestant or rationalist—who denies the Church's divine authority, who regards it with horror as a force extrinsic to the faithful, crushing their minds, and not simply as their own collective mind uttered for them—a dogma is but a human product. To the orthodox or Bible Protestant, Scripture alone is God's word, while the creeds that are drawn from it are man's devices—useful it may be, but not infallible. To the rationalistic Protestant, even Scripture is but a provisional attempt to give symbolic utterance to the felt but unknown object of our religious instinct. No utterance of divine truth, in or out of the Bible, is permanent or final. Each age needs quietly to modify the symbolism of the preceding, to the better expression of its own religious emotions and aspirations. But to the Catholic, the language and symbolism in which Christ clothed His revelation was divinely chosen and approved, not as equating our mind to what necessarily transcends its exact apprehension and expression, but as conveying as much of the truths of eternity as we are capable of receiving in our present embryonic state of intellectual development. Every letter of that deposit is therefore treasured. But since the value of words changes and the symbolism of one nation differs from that of another, it is needful to know precisely what were the mental ideas conveyed by the words of revelation to its first hearers. However much those mental ideas fall short of the ineffable realities they represent; yet the faltering words in which they are conveyed to us are still more defective, ill-fitting, ambiguous. The Church's labour is not only to preserve these words, but to explain them, to keep their original sense, to save them from being twisted and perverted.

Most of her dogma is directed to this task of fencing round revealed truths from the innumerable misunderstandings to which they are exposed. The whole of the Athanasian Creed is occupied with safeguarding the single idea conveyed in the formula of Baptism. Her doctrine of transubstantiation explains the precise sense of: "This is My body." Heretics, by their negations, have built up a large part of our dogma, which, when they are forgotten, may be forgotten too—that part namely which consists of verbal rather than real definitions, which reasserts ancient conceptions to the exclusion of false developments and interpretations, rather than asserts any new aspect or extension of a revealed truth; which consists of conservative rather than of progressive utterances.

Thus the Catholic regards the Church's final expression of truth, which we call dogma, as being of divine authority—differing from the Scriptural expression only in this, that in revelation the language, though human, is divinely chosen and inspired; in dogma it is chosen by human labour and only guaranteed from error through the intervention of Providence acting, not miraculously, but according to established laws.

The first part of the present work vindicates for the Church this divine doctrinal authority. It insists on the conception of the Church as a living social organism, in union with which the individual is put *en rapport* with the animating Spirit, and made partaker of the common mind of Christianity, past and present. Then, having settled the question of the Church's right to teach and to preserve the original deposit, the author goes on to the more difficult point touching the nature of this conservative function and how it is reconcilable with evolution in dogma.

M. Auguste Sabatier, pointing to the fragments of various philosophies and of other older religious systems, which the Church seems to have incorporated into her dogmatic teaching; and also to the changes which the dogmas themselves seem to have undergone in course of time, would have us conclude that her doctrinal system has been not merely modified, but wholly created by evolution; that there is no abiding germ or deposit which is the subject of development; no fixed or natural order of progress in our expression of divine truth, but only an aimless succession of variations, such as that by which dialects (unfixed by literature) pass into one another through their inherent instability and not in obedience to any purpose-directed law. One may be better, or worse than another, according to the intellectual condition of the people; but not in virtue of any essential plan of structure which demands and controls development.

He implies that no idea or concept of the divinity can be more than an almost arbitrary symbol; that as we picture the magnet's influence as an 'attraction,' a voluntary reaching out an invisible arm and grasping and drawing in; so do we picture the object of our religious and moral emotions as a person like ourselves in all things, but infinitely magnified. In each case our concept is said to be only a convenient summary of experienced phenomena, but with no further objective value. By developing our idea of a person, we should get no nearer to

the nature of this object called God, than by studying the form of the letters of which the word 'person' is composed. For in this a symbol differs from an analogue or metaphor. The latter results from a comparison between the object and something else that in part resembles it; within limits, we may increase our knowledge of the original by studying its imperfect representation. But a symbol, as we here use the term, is simply a fanciful or poetical cause for a known unaccountable effect. It does pretend to resemble the cause. Given certain devout feelings, they might have a thousand hypothetical explanations; and of these a personal God is one. The Ptolemaic system of *radius-vectors*, the electric fluid or current, the corpuscular, and even the undulatory theory of light, are all symbolic so far as, beyond summarizing phenomena, they stand for, but in no way profess to resemble, their unknown causes.

But the ordinary notions of theistic religion are not, as Sabatier implies, merely symbolic; they are, however inadequate and ill-fitting, true representative analogies. It is not that things are *as though* there were a First Cause, personal, intelligent, benevolent; but there is a Reality which, addressing itself to our finite mind through the broken language of creation, of necessity creates in us the notions answering to these terms. They are no more arbitrary or of our own poetic making than the impressions we receive through our sane senses, which are determined from without as well as from within, and cannot be altered at will. In a word, they are natural analogies, and not mere symbols, or explanatory figures.

And the same must be said of those notions under which supernatural truths have been revealed to us. They are not as symbols which can be altered and substituted at will, but are true analogies whose representative value is real, though not exactly definable. Likeness and unlikeness are mixed therein in varying proportions, nor is it possible accurately to define their limits; yet this does not deprive them of true representative value or reduce them to mere arbitrary symbols. Thus we apprehend eternal truths, not in their separate distinctness, but as it were in solution, in as far as they can be fused into finite and human ideas, forms of thought and expression.

This utterance which Christ has given them in the conceptions and language of His time and race constitutes the deposit of Catholic faith, the stable element which gives unity and coherence to the progress of theology. It is the function of

authority to hold fast this form of sound words, to guard its original meaning against perversions arising from the imperfection of language, to supervise and control the evolution and development of its content. But this function supposes a process to be controlled; not merely an instability, an aimless flux, a forgetfulness in the human mind, but a movement of steady advance. Usually in these days the "idea" is personified and credited with an inherent expansiveness; nor is this point of view void of advantages; but in truth it is rather the human mind which is the subject of growth. As our mental eye opens wider and wider, we see more and more. Plainly it is thus with regard to physical science. Nature is just what she was a thousand years ago. But by associated work, by men heaping their experiences and reflections together, the collective scientific mind has multiplied its percipience indefinitely. We do not deny all causality to the object, as though Nature herself were not effectively co-operant in this advance. Though the sun could not create the eye, out of nothing; could not develop sight in a stone; yet where there is latent power of vision, light will force its way in,—will wake and expand it. So, too, the order and uniformity of sequence and co-existence which prevails in Nature must beat upon the human mind until it elicits from it all the response it is capable of. In like manner, the divine truth that is embodied in the deposit of Christian revelation, gradually shapes the Church's collective mind into a more perfect conformity with itself, and exercises the office of *idée directrice* in regard to its growth.

In respect to matters of divine faith there can be no accretion, no development in the strict sense, but only an evolution. To all intents and purposes the deposit of faith is as a document delivered once and for all into the Church's hands to which she can add, from which she can take, not an iota or tittle. Her only mental progress in its regard is that of a clearer, deeper penetration of its meaning. But in the illustration and expression of its meaning there is room for something more akin to development. The original language and analogy in which its ideas were divinely expressed admit of translation in other languages, permeated perhaps by other philosophies. Over all these essays at interpreting the Word to diverse intelligences and in diverse tongues the Church sits as judge, and declares what is true and false, *in sensu auctoris*. Herein she seems to incorporate much extraneous matter into

her dogma—symbolic images, philosophical modes of conception, scientific and historical opinions. But all these she uses solely as instruments of expression, not as sources of truth. We are sometimes told that the Church has added Aristotle to the Gospel; that to be a Catholic is to be a hylomorphist; that transubstantiation involves the ten categories of the peripatetics. In truth there is no man, however ignorant, without a philosophy; and though in all systems there is an element of agreement answering to the common structure of the human mind, none of them is perfect or final. No one can speak ten words, nor can the Church utter a single dogma without assuming some philosophy or other. When she speaks, she takes that which prevails with her hearers, and uses it to express her mind as nearly as may be; just as a missionary dealing with primitive savages has to avail himself of their modes of thought and expression, and to translate the Gospel as closely as so rude a medium, so coarse an instrument, may permit. If a man asks a question in Chinese, it is no use answering him in English; if the middle ages asked the Church questions in the language of Aristotle, it had been no use for her to answer in the language of Kant. She cares nothing for the theory of substance and accident in itself, but only so far as by that theory she can best insist on the literal sense of *Hoc est corpus meum*—can best secure those words meaning to us what they meant to the Apostles.

But development as distinct from evolution, finds its place in those applications of revealed truth which are matter of Catholic doctrine rather than of divine faith. The faith is not like a foreign germ intruded into the mind, developing independently within itself, irrespective of the rest of our beliefs and experiences. Contrariwise it works itself into the whole texture of our thought, determining it and being in return determined by it. Thus, revealed truths entering into combination with unrevealed, give birth to practical and speculative conclusions, which are part of Catholic, or at least theological, teaching, but not of divine faith.

"Obviously in moral matters, as we have said elsewhere in these pages, the changing conditions of each age and country call for ever new applications of the unchanging principles of revealed religion; and no less frequently are new truths of science and history brought into comparison and combination with the articles of faith, to give birth to theological conclusions,

unknown and unknowable to former generations. To contrast unfavourably the vast complex body of present Catholic teaching with the original simplicity of the Gospel and the Apostles Creed, is to forget that the Christian religion is a leaven, leavening the whole mass of secular knowledge, moral and speculative, feeding upon it and transforming it into its own substance ; even as Christian practice mingles itself with every department of human life, social or solitary." It were as reasonable to refuse to recognize the gnarled oak to be the legitimate successor of the slender sapling of centuries ago.

We do not mean to make P. de la Barre answerable for all these reflections which have been suggested by the perusal of his stimulating book ; but we hope we have been substantially faithful to his mind. His chapters on the use of symbolic images, theological analogues, and theological systematizations, as instruments of development, are as original as they are sound and useful.

His appended essay on the evolution of sciences as compared with that of theology would merit separate treatment, did space permit, raising, as it does, the whole question as to the doctrinal value of physics, and the objectivity of its laws and classifications. But we may notice in conclusion that if we confine ourselves to theology proper, as opposed to apologetic, the parallel between its evolution and that of science is as close as the difference of subject-matter will allow. This difference lies in the fact that whereas the subject-matter upon which the physicist speculates, is added to every day by new experiences which increase the 'deposit,' as it were, of Nature's revelation, the Christian revelation does not admit of objective addition. However perfectly we may know the internal arrangement and connection of parts in any whole, we know it and them still better, when that whole itself is known as a subordinate part of some still greater organism or system. As the sphere submitted to the observation of the physicist is widened every day, newer and higher generalizations become possible than could ever have been drawn from his former field of experience. But the deposit of revealed truth can never receive the light that a wider experience of the same order sheds on a narrower ; but only such as comes through a closer examination of its own content, and a comparison thereof with the natural truths and facts of which the human mind is in possession. Roughly, the difference is like that which

prevails between astronomy or any other physical science studied solely from a book, and studied from nature. In one case the evidence at our disposal is limited, in the other, indefinite. We might study the text-book with continual advance in the mastery of its contents; we might apply the resulting knowledge in many ways and combine it with the rest of our ideas and experiences; but had we no other source of astronomical information, it is evident that our condition would be very different to what it is.

Another point of dissimilarity between science and theology is found in the fact that science deals with external phenomena, which can be pointed out and named exactly; whereas theology, like philosophy, deals largely with abstract notions which can be only symbolized by signs that appeal to eye and ear. Hence it is difficult to be sure that in the case of any two persons the same word stands for precisely the same interior idea. Moreover, the realities that revelation deals with are, if not below the horizon of human apprehension, at least on its extreme verge—to be touched from afar but never to be compassed; whereas physical nature is comfortably within our grasp.

For these reasons, even when the work of apologetic is accomplished and the Christian revelation accepted as a basis of operation, the evolution of theology can never exhibit anything like the clearness, the exactitude, the unanimity of physical science. In the scholasticism of the middle ages we have perhaps the best, though of course an unfinished, attempt at a mere dilectical unfolding of the content of revelation; and, on the whole, the agreement between theologians in those days was nearly as close as that between scientists of our own. But when the assumptions upon which this orderly fabric was raised began to be assailed under the disintegrating influence of renaissance principles, when, in due logical process, the authority, first of the Church, afterwards of Scripture and of Christ, and lastly of conscience and reason itself, was called in question, this peaceful work of internal evolution was to some extent broken off in favour of the more urgent duty of strengthening the foundations. Apologetic, which had practically no place in the *Summa* of Aquinas, has since then steadily grown in importance, in such sort that, in non-Catholic usage, it is now almost identified with theology; nor, relatively to the needs of the modern mind, is any point disputed in the *Summa*

of much consequence compared with the assumptions upon which the whole system rests.

To speak of apologetic as a science is not, as P. de la Barre points out, strictly correct. It is a method more or less 'opportunistic' for securing one way or another—according to diversities of age, civilization, culture, character, and the like—that certitude which is the condition of faith. It is a scientific art rather than a science like theology proper, to which it is related somewhat as induction to deduction. Dealing as they do with the deepest problems of life and thought, it is not wonderful if apologists contrast very unfavourably with scientists; and if, in their vagueness and disagreements, they are rather like philosophers, with whom they have many problems in common. The philosopher is one who deals with the assumptions which the scientist accepts without hesitation—not on scientific grounds, but because they have to be made every moment of practical life, and have therefore become irresistible psychological habits, though, rationally, they are as obscure and difficult to defend as the assumptions of theological science. As children think light of parental anxieties in their regard, so the physicist as a rule is untroubled by the philosopher's fear lest the world-supporting elephant of science be standing on an unsupported tortoise. He is usually confident that, did he but care to try, his methods would carry him backwards to the sources of certitude, as easily as they carry him forward towards its limitless extensions. At all events he feels the practical man's contempt for the sceptical questioning and quixotic defending of beliefs which every one holds, and must hold, under psychological, if not under rational compulsion.

Similarly, those who, thanks to their Catholic education and surroundings, have lived in the Church as in a little world where the principles of revealed religion are assumed in thought and practice—somewhat as the principles of vulgar science are assumed in all human life—whose minds have been subjected to the influence of the public mind of that ecclesiastical society whose members they are, and have been insensibly dominated by its authority; whose acceptance of the said principles owes its firmness more to psychological habit than to any rational argument or conception—these will be apt to underrate the difficulties of apologetic, and to fancy that the methods of scientific theology can be carried backwards behind its first principles as easily as forwards in front of them.

Theology and science have it in common, that it is only by repeated practical assumption, by being lived and acted upon continually, that their principles can gain the psychological firmness without which mere rational justification is of little avail. Still, this rational justification has a negative and conditional value ; if it cannot produce faith or conviction, it can remove obstacles and prepare the way for the action of those practical causes of certitude which God and Nature have provided as sufficient to satisfy minds that were constructed as little for speculation as our bodies were for swimming. We can swim in a poor way, but not as a fish ; and we can paddle in the shallows of speculation, or traverse its surface, but we are too short-breathed to explore its depths ; nor are we really at home except on the *terra firma* of action.

G. TYRRELL.

The Taking of Seringapatam, May 4th, 1799.

A CENTENARY STUDY.

A VICTORY which, a hundred years ago, gained for the British Government undisputed ascendancy in Southern India, and paved the way for the formation in due time of our Indian Empire, is worthy of at least a passing remembrance on its first centenary.

By the fall of Seringapatam, the most troublesome of all the native princes who were inimical to British rule was swept away, and other open or secret enemies overawed into submission. The victory, moreover, is important for another reason ; it first brought into prominence a general destined to restore peace to Europe by the overthrow of Napoleon—Arthur Wellesley, later known as the great Duke of Wellington.

The name of Tippoo Sahib is scarcely thought of now as a name of dread. It but recalls to most men a fierce, cruel, and crafty Oriental despot, who gave some trouble in his day, but was speedily overthrown by the valour of British troops. Yet, a hundred years ago Tippoo was one of our most formidable enemies in the East.

His father, Hyder Ali—be it remarked—the utterly illiterate grandson of a howling dervish, had risen by sheer force of will from the rank of a common soldier to that of ruler of Mysore ; although he could not read even a letter of the alphabet. He had dethroned Kistna, the rightful rajah, seized the reins of government, and founded, as he hoped, in his own family, a new and Mohammedan dynasty.

To this powerful and stubborn old adversary of the British Government succeeded Tippoo, who, together with the sovereignty of Mysore, became the possessor of vast wealth and the head of an immense army. His treasury contained nearly four millions sterling, besides jewels of incalculable worth, and

his fighting men numbered more than a hundred thousand. Though inferior to his father in genius and ability, Tippoo was nevertheless an enemy to be feared.

His darling object was to drive the British from India, and in this he was actuated, not only by Moslem fanaticism, but also by private vengeance. Lord Cornwallis, during his administration, had considerably lowered the pride of the formidable Sultan of Mysore, and deprived him of a notable portion of his possessions. To carry out the end he had set himself to accomplish, Tippoo began to intrigue with the Courts of Poonah and Hyderabad, in order to neutralize British influence in those quarters, and did his best to induce Zemaun Shah to invade Hindustan; finally he entered into secret treaty with the French by means of the Mauritius.

The Earl of Mornington, afterwards created Marquis Wellesley, on his arrival in India as Governor-General in May, 1798, found that the British possessions were menaced on all sides, and that Madras especially was in the greatest peril. The news, true or false, which greeted him on his landing—that Bonaparte was contemplating an advance into India by the Red Sea, and that France had already disembarked troops at Mangalore, convinced him that prompt measures were necessary. A somewhat hasty order was issued to General Harris, the acting-governor of Madras, to prepare without delay to march against Tippoo Sahib, and attack him in his capital. This was eventually found to be practically impossible at the time, and the order was recalled. Meanwhile Lord Mornington's repeated remonstrances with Tippoo as to his negotiations with France while he ostensibly professed amity towards Great Britain, met with no further result than evasive answers. It was accordingly decided to declare war against Mysore, and the preparations, which had never really ceased since the arrival of the new Governor-General, were concluded by March, 1799, when the transport of the British forces began.

Colonel Wellesley, who was in command of the Thirty-third regiment of foot, though not yet thirty years of age, had already seen active service in the Netherlands, when he landed with his troops in India in 1797. The young officer's reputation for coolness of judgment and intrepid bravery, quite as much as the fact of his being Lord Mornington's younger brother, led to his appointment, at the request of Meer Allum, the native leader, to the command of the troops furnished by the Nizam of Hyder-

abad. These consisted of 6,000 foot and 10,000 horse, and were reinforced by Colonel Wellesley's own regiment.

The whole force under General Harris numbered 30,000 fighting men, and the ponderous baggage and numerous camp-followers of the Nizam's contingent, the ordnance, stores and provisions, together with about 40,000 Brinjarries, or native grain merchants, formed, in Colonel Wellesley's own words, "a multitude in motion which covered eighteen square miles."

In addition to the Madras forces, a contingent 6,000 strong set out from Bombay, and after landing at Cannanore, ascended the Ghauts in the direction of Seringapatam, under the command of General Stuart. A sudden and sharp attack made upon this division by the Mysore troops was successfully resisted, and the enemy driven off with only slight loss to the British.

Throughout this campaign, Tippoo gave but little evidence of his customary skill and discretion as a general. Nothing would have been easier than to have harassed the main body on its advance, by desultory skirmishes and other movements of the kind; he might thus have effectually weakened the British troops without risking a regular engagement, and at the same time have made himself master of a large amount of stores and ammunition. He was, however, content with some slight show of this kind of warfare, without effecting anything worthy of note. His heart was really set upon openly assailing the main body. The opportunity afforded him at Malavelly must have effectually quenched such desires. In a critical engagement in which the Thirty-third and their commander played a prominent part, the Mysore troops were repulsed with the loss of at least 1,000 men, while the British casualties were very slight.

On April 5th the Madras army came in sight of the capital of Mysore. Situated on an island, measuring three miles in length by a mile in width, in the River Cauvery, Seringapatam (*Sri-Ranga-Patana*), "City of Vishnu," had been so strengthened during the previous three years by additional defences, that it was regarded by Tippoo as virtually impregnable. It was his constant boastful cry, "Who can take Seringapatam?" The river front was strongly fortified, and above the massive walls, which enclosed some hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants, towered the palace and mosque, embellished with numerous domes and minarets. Beyond the line of the fortifications, at the lower eastern extremity of the island, were gardens; among them was the "Red Garden" (*Lal Bagh*), containing the

mausoleum built by Tippoo to enshrine the remains of his father.

General Harris placed his camp on the river bank, facing east, and opposite to the west front of the fortifications, at a distance of some 3,500 yards. His rear was protected by rough ground, his left stationed towards the river bank. The position took Tippoo by surprise. Lord Cornwallis on former occasions had attacked the fortifications from the north, and the defences had consequently been more effectually strengthened on that side. General Harris, quite contrary to expectation, had suddenly crossed the river by a neglected ford, and approached the city from the south, where the fortifications were weakest. In this position, the Bombay contingent under General Stuart were able to effect a junction with the main forces without difficulty.

An aqueduct, which took a winding course towards the city in the form of the letter S, partly sheltered the camp. In its upper loop was a *tope* or grove, which took its name from the village of Sultanpetah contained in the lower loop. The rocky ground nearer the city was occupied by the enemy, who, sheltered by the aqueduct, considerably harassed the camp by continual discharges of rocket-javelins. To put a stop to this annoyance General Harris directed Colonels Shaw and Wellesley to dislodge the enemy from these outposts by a night attack. The former officer, who commanded the left, was able to gain possession of the village, but Wellesley's attempt, on the right, failed to secure its end. The Thirty-third were thrown into confusion by the violent resistance of the enemy, and the night was so dark that it was impossible to ascertain the post they had to occupy. The command of a second attack in the same spot was offered on the next day to General Baird, but he good-naturedly suggested that Colonel Wellesley should have an opportunity of making good his failure, and the Commander-in-chief consented. Accordingly at ten o'clock Wellesley with the Scotch Brigade and two battalions of Sepoys made another attempt, which was entirely successful. The incident of the night attack on Sultanpetah Tope would be scarcely worthy of notice, were it not for the temporary failure of the future conqueror of Napoleon—a failure which, but for Baird's good feeling, might have changed the issue of our Continental wars. The intervention of Baird on behalf of the younger officer has been contradicted by some, but the evidence of Colonel

Gerard, afterwards Adjutant-General of the Bengal Army, who was engaged in the siege, places the fact beyond doubt.

By means of these preliminary encounters the position of the British forces was greatly strengthened; a strong line of posts being placed from the tope to the river bank, a distance of about two miles. The operations being thus facilitated, the siege was carried on with great vigour. Several formidable sallies of Tippoo's horse were repulsed by the steady opposition of the besieging infantry; Colonel Wellesley commanding in the most exposed part of the trenches and displaying the utmost vigilance and promptitude in action.

Twice during the siege Tippoo made overtures of peace—first when his men were dislodged from the advanced posts, and again when twenty days' siege had rendered his situation critical. The terms submitted by General Harris were (1) the cession by the Sultan of half his territories, (2) renunciation for ever of any French alliance, and (3) the payment of a large indemnity towards the expenses of the war. These conditions Tippoo indignantly refused. He seems to have been quite aware that his fate was sealed, but with the spirit of a doomed man he would die sword in hand.

Since no other course was open the siege proceeded rapidly. General Stuart's force had been sent across the river, and on April 30, a severe cross fire from both sides was directed against the north-west bastion. A breach was in due course effected and it was determined to make an assault on May 4. The water in the hard bed of the river was found to be only a few feet deep, and no insurmountable obstacles were apparent.

Early in the day the troops destined for the assault, consisting of 2,500 Europeans and 1,800 Native soldiers, were placed in the trenches. At one o'clock, just at the time when the burning heat usually disposed the enemy to take repose and refreshment, General Baird, who was to lead the attack, leaping out from the trenches, cried, as he waved his sword, "Come, my brave fellows, follow me, and prove yourselves worthy of the name of British soldiers!" He immediately sprang down the slope leading to the bed of the river, followed by the men in close array. The enemy at once brought a deadly fire to bear upon them, speedily thinning their ranks.

In face of a fierce resistance the forlorn hope in less than ten minutes had mounted the breach. Sergeant Graham, of the Bombay European Regiment, who led the way, planted the

colours on the rampart as he cried, "I'll show them the British flag!" He was at that moment shot through the head. A sally made on the flank of the assaulting column by Tippoo's picked troops was gallantly repulsed. The British swept irresistibly forward, and swarmed through the breach which was 100 feet wide.

Baird divided his men into two columns under Colonels Sherbrooke and Dunlop; these charged right and left and cleared the ramparts. Dunlop was conspicuous for his brave bearing under attack; one of Tippoo's sirdars having assailed him when half way up the breach, he cleft open the man's breast by his vigorous stroke, and though he received in turn a slash from the dying sirdar which nearly severed his right hand, he continued to lead forward his men till he fell from loss of blood and had to be conveyed to the rear.

The inner ditch was crossed by means of some scaffolding which workmen had left near the spot and which served as a bridge. Lord Roberts, as he stood on the breach in 1884, "marvelled how heavily armed men could have ventured to cross the single plank which alone spanned the deep broad ditch of the inner defences."¹ The Mysore troops resisted with the greatest bravery, but they were unable to stand against the vigorous onslaught and were forced back upon the Palace, which was eventually surrendered after terrible slaughter, and Tippoo's two young sons, who had been placed there for shelter, were taken prisoners.

Tippoo had that day sent large presents to the Brahmins and asked their prayers; they had predicted that the 4th of May would be inauspicious for him. Early in the day he had gone as usual to one of the cavaliers in the outer rampart to observe the progress of the siege. When the alarm was given that an assault was being made, he was seated at dinner under a covered shed. Mounting his horse he at once made for the breach, and finding his troops flying before Dunlop's column, rallied them and attempted to withstand the attack, repeatedly firing on the British and killing many.

When beaten back he continued to defend, in company with his bravest officers and men, the traverses of the northern ramparts, one after another, till the Twelfth regiment crossed the inner ditch. At the gate of the inner fort he received a shot in the body, and again another, and then his horse was

¹ *Forty-one Years in India*, vol. ii. p. 387.

shot under him. His people placed him in his palanquin close to the gateway, and there, faint and exhausted, he was found by the British. A soldier, greedy of loot, seized the Sultan's belt, which was very costly, and tried to drag it off. Tippoo, summoning all his strength, struck at the man with his sword and wounded him in the knee. The soldier at once shot him through the head. As no less than 300 men were killed around the Sultan, it was impossible to remove his body till later. It was found buried under a heap of slain, being identified by his attendants. It had been stripped not only of the jewelled turban, costly pearl necklace, and ruby ring, which Tippoo had been wearing that day, but even of every vestige of clothing.

The plunder and bloodshed within the city present a picture too horrible to contemplate. The presence of some 40,000 men of various nationalities flushed with victory, resulted in the unrestrained indulgence of every kind of excess, until the appointment of a Governor on the following day restored order. Some criticism was excited at the time by the offer of this post to Colonel Wellesley, who had commanded the reserve, and had therefore taken no active part in the attack; while General Baird, who had himself spent three years in the dungeons of Seringapatam some fifteen years before, and had been the actual leader of the assaulting columns, was passed over. Without disparagement to the latter's thorough capability for the post in question, it must be owned that the appointment of Wellesley was a wise and foreseeing measure, productive of speedy results in the restoration of discipline and maintenance of order.

The fruits of victory were immense. The arsenal with its resources—451 brass and 478 iron guns, 520,000 lbs. of powder, 424,000 round shot, and other stores—became the property of the conquerors. The provisions for defence were on a scale rather to be expected in some old established European state than in a newly constituted Indian dynasty. Besides these spoils, there was an incredible amount of bullion, jewels, plate, and valuables, housed and secured in splendid style. Huge warehouses were found, filled with furniture and costly articles of every description—among them two elephant mangers of silver.

One of the first cares of Colonel Wellesley was to seek out, by desire of the British Government, the representative of the old Hindoo dynasty, a descendant of the dethroned Rajah.

Kistna; he was found to be gaining his livelihood as a potter, and was restored to his lawful dignity, with the town of Mysore for his residence and the capital of his state. A representative of the dynasty still bears sway as Rajah of Mysore. Tippoo's wives and sons received pensions and were sent to Vellore; one of his descendants is at this day a native officer in our Indian army.

Thus did the stronghold of Seringapatam fall into the hands of the British by means of "one of the greatest blows"—to quote Alison—"ever struck by any nation." The cost of the victory to our troops was comparatively slight. Only 387 men were killed or wounded during the actual assault, although the total number of those who fell during the siege is reckoned at 1,400.

The bravery of our troops met with somewhat tardy recognition at the hands of the Government. General Harris was raised to the peerage as Baron Harris of Seringapatam and Mysore in the final peace of 1815. He was granted, moreover, that heraldic monstrosity known as an "honourable augmentation" in his coat of arms. One cannot but lament that dishonour should so often be done to heraldry, by way of conferring honour on an illustrious name, as in the case in question. The crest, consisting of Tippoo's tiger pierced by an arrow, might pass unchallenged; so too, even the incongruous supporters, "a grenadier and sepoy proper;" but the "grenades fired proper," and above all, the pictorial representation of the citadel are in the worst possible heraldic taste.

General Baird was made a baronet in 1809, but escaped the questionable honour of an "augmentation." General Floyd, commander of the cavalry, was rewarded in a like manner in 1816, and the victory was also commemorated in his armorial bearings.

For the rest of the officers and men who took part in the siege a general medal was struck in 1808—one of the first instances in which every individual present in an engagement was thus distinguished. The medal is not of a high order of artistic merit. It contains a somewhat vulgar representation of the British lion treading down the prostrate tiger of Mysore—figures suggestive of kittens at play—and an inscription in Arabic, "The Lion of God is the Conqueror." On the reverse is portrayed the assault of the citadel under a burning sun. The medal was struck in gold for general officers, silver-gilt for field

officers, silver for captains and subalterns, bronze for British soldiers, and tin for Sepoys.

The regiments taking part in the siege were entitled to bear the legend "Seringapatam" on their colours. Of the cavalry regiments none now survive, owing to the disbandment after the final peace. Many infantry regiments still retain the distinction. These are the Suffolk Regiment, Duke of Wellington's, Black Watch, Duke of Cambridge's Own, Highland Light Infantry, Gordon Highlanders, Connaught Rangers, and Royal Dublin Fusiliers.

The remains of the ill-fated Tippoo were interred with becoming pomp in the noble mausoleum he had erected over the tomb of his father, Hyder Ali, in the Lal Bagh. The building, beautified by a dome and minarets, and pillars of black marble, was further enriched by double doors of costly inlaid ivory by Lord Dalhousie during his administration.

There, under the crimson pall which shrouds his tomb, whose inscription designates the fallen monarch as a "Martyr to Islam," lies the persistent and powerful adversary, by whose fall we climbed many strides on the ascent which has culminated in the Empire of India.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O.S.B.

Are they Lawless?

THE charge of lawlessness, so energetically pressed against the extreme High Churchmen just now, is a charge which has always clung to their party. And yet the principle of Church authority is one of their chief watch-words. On the other hand, the party which is most active in bringing the charge is the very party which holds the notion of Church authority in suspicion as Popish. The paradox is not inexplicable, but it is grotesque, and points to the existence of a flaw somewhere in the system.

Not unnaturally the Ritualists¹ repudiate the charge, and we have lately been reading two letters in vindication of their attitude, addressed by Lord Halifax to Mr. Balfour and Lord George Hamilton. We have also had sent to us for review his *Letter to the Bishop of Winchester*, in which he develops at greater length the grounds on which the party take their stand.

Of course we do not admit the position of the Ritualists to be theologically sound. But, as regards this particular charge of lawlessness, it seems to us they have a sufficiently good defence for themselves. Their contention is that they are very willing to obey the authority of their Church when it is duly exercised, but that they decline to recognize as the voice of their Church the voice of the Civil Courts which Parliament has recently set over them. They decline also to bind themselves beforehand to accept *quand même* the decisions of any Court whatever, lawful or unlawful. In the abstract both these contentions are sound.

In Mr. Spencer Holland's *Summary of the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, a French Canadian case is mentioned in which the then Curé of Montreal had refused burial in consecrated ground to the body of a Monsieur Guibord,

¹ We designate them by this name with some reluctance, as they resent it. But we cannot call them Catholics, and no other convenient name suggests itself. On the other hand, as the controversy in which they are now engaged turns so much on Ritual, there seems no reason why they should refuse to be so called. At all events it is here used in no wish to hurt any one's feelings.

on the plea that he was excommunicate and a "public sinner." The Superior Court of Canada, and, on appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, ordered the Curé to permit the burial. These Courts, such being the terms of the cession of Canada to England, took the law of the Catholic Church as the rule of their judgment, but decided that this law did not justify the Curé's conduct. Was the Curé bound to submit to their decision? Whether he did submit or not we do not know, but certainly he ought not to have submitted—that is, to such a Court in such a matter, though of course if his own ecclesiastical superiors took the same view of the Church's law as the Civil Court, he was bound to let the burial take place. He ought not to have submitted to the usurped authority, but to have prepared himself rather to face its punishments; and therefore he was not lawless. May not the Ritualists, then, take up the same attitude of resistance to the ecclesiastical judgments of the Civil Courts, and yet not be open to the charge of lawlessness? If, indeed, it were palpable that these are the Courts lawfully set over them in virtue of the fundamental constitution of their Church, their resistance would be lawless. But the point is—Are not their opponents begging the question? It seems to us they are, and that the Ritualists have got a real grievance in the way in which, during the present century, Parliament has reconstituted their ecclesiastical Courts.

Then as to the other point in the charge against them. Their Bishops have undertaken to regulate their services, and have been gratified by very general professions of readiness to obey. Yet amidst these professions of obedience a seemingly discordant note has been heard. It is particularly, we believe, with reference to the proposed voluntary court of the two Archbishops that some—Lord Halifax leading them—have put in a reservation. They have every desire to obey; but cannot pledge themselves to accept beforehand the archiepiscopal decisions; they must first see what they are. "Here at all events," say their opponents, "is rank disobedience, for you acknowledge this time that the judges are your lawful superiors in such matters." The reproach seems plausible. But again how curious the paradox it involves. The same people who are thus righteously indignant with the Ritualists for making their reservations, profess to be scandalized with us Catholics because we will not make such reservations. To us they say "how can you promise beforehand unlimited obedience to the Pope when

you cannot tell whether his mandates may not revolt your conscience?" To the Ritualists they say, "How can you refuse an unlimited obedience to your Bishops, seeing that they are your acknowledged superiors?" But our answer to the charge against ourselves will meet the Ritualists' case as well. When there is the guarantee of infallibility we can promise unlimited obedience, because that guarantee assures us that we never can be asked to do or believe what a properly instructed conscience would condemn. When there is not this guarantee, or at least a guarantee of practical security, we cannot and do not pledge ourselves to unlimited obedience. We say "at least a guarantee of practical security," because in the Catholic Church, though infallibility does not attach to the acts of Bishops—or even to all the acts of the Pope—we are practically certain that we need not anticipate from Pope or Bishop any mandate to renounce a true doctrine or essential practice of the Catholic faith. Still there are conceivable cases in which a Bishop or even a Pope might order one to do something really and patently sinful. And in such cases the duty of a Catholic would be to refuse compliance. What is recorded of Bishop Grosseteste supplies a good illustration. If a Bishop were ordered to institute to a benefice a man whom he *knew* for certain to be of evil life and a danger to any flock entrusted to him, he would be justified in declining. He might say, perhaps, "If the man is appointed over my head, I shall not interfere." But he should decline to make the appointment by any positive act of his own. It is in view of such possible though unlikely contingencies that in the rules of the Society of Jesus it is expressly stipulated that the Superior is always to be obeyed "except when sin is discerned" (in the order given). That is our own position, and the position of the Ritualists who follow Lord Halifax is like it—like it in one respect, but most unlike it in another. They need not indeed anticipate any such order to do a wrong as Bishop Grosseteste was confronted with. But what they evidently and reasonably do fear is lest the Archbishops' Court should at some time or other pronounce in favour of re-marriage after divorce, and we cannot wonder that with such presentiments they should feel it dangerous to be so effusive as others had been in their promises of submission. Nor can we see that reservations of this kind justify the charge of lawlessness.

Still, it will be rejoined, no one asks them to submit to what their conscience condemns. If their Bishops bid them re-marry

divorced persons, let them refuse by all means, but let them also, if they refuse, leave the Church which disagrees with them and go elsewhere. And so too, if the Archbishops' Court should pronounce against the Real Presence or the Sacrifice of the Mass. But here a further difficulty presents itself. This same question was put by Archbishop Tait to Mr. Maconochie, when under examination before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. Mr. Maconochie's reply was, "I do not think, your Grace, one would be free to leave the only Society one can belong to, the Catholic Church. If I belong to a voluntary society, and there are discomforts, of course I would leave."

The reply is probably unintelligible to the class of Protestants, according to whose ingrained notions Churches are purely voluntary corporations, freely set up by those who find themselves in sufficient accord to associate for common worship. But it was a reply in logical consistency with the belief that the Established Church is the only legitimate branch of the Catholic Church in this country.

Prima facie, then, the conduct of the Ritualists is not open to the charge of lawlessness. It is another matter whether they can make good their contention that the system of government and ritual against which they revolt, but to which it is sought to oblige them, is not the genuine system authorized by the Reformation Settlement. If they can make this contention good, or even if they make good a really probable argument in its favour, no one has a right to call them lawless, merely because he disagrees with their conclusions. If this argument breaks down altogether, and is palpably unsound, then their adherence to it becomes mere perversity, and they may rightly be called lawless. What, then, are the facts?

There are two points, one regarding the authority of the present ecclesiastical Courts, the other regarding the particular judgments which these Courts have delivered. Lord Halifax, in the *Letter to the Bishop of Winchester*, discusses the one, and Mr. James Parker, in *The Ornaments Rubric*, of which a sixth edition has just appeared, discusses the other.

As regards the Courts themselves, we may ask (1) Is the fountain of their authority such as the Reformation Settlement contemplated? (2) Is their composition conformable to that Settlement? As at present constituted, they draw their authority from the Crown, and are composed of lawyers, who need not even be members of the Anglican Church,

Is this what the Reformation Settlement intended? Lord Halifax answers "No" to both counts.

On the source of authority, his argument suffers from a fallacy which vitiates it all through. He might decline as a test the legislation of Henry VIII. alone, but take the legislation of Elizabeth, which is the most favourable to the Ritualistic interpretation. The statute still in force by which the Royal Supremacy was re-enacted after the lapse under Mary—that is, 1 Eliz., cap. 1—differs in one particular from the corresponding legislation under Henry VIII. Elizabeth contented herself with the more modest title of "supreme governor" instead of "supreme head." But in other respects she took over the same powers as her father and brother—for what she took over were "such jurisdictions privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used, for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities," all which "shall for ever by authority of this present Parliament, be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." Nothing ampler can be found in the Henrician statutes, and Elizabeth, in her explanation, said expressly that "nothing was, is, or shall be meant or intended by the same oath (of supremacy) to have any other duty, allegiance or bond required by the same oath than was acknowledged to be due to the most noble kings of famous memory, King Henry VIII., her Majesty's father, or King Edward VI., her Majesty's brother." She does not mean to claim any more than they did, which is as much as to say that she does mean to claim all that they did, and he would be a bold man who should deny that their claim for the English Crown was to be the very fountain on earth of just that same spiritual jurisdiction (apart of course from the power of order, and that in the Catholic Church was never called jurisdiction) which the Pope had hitherto been allowed to have. Moreover, in 1 Eliz., cap. 1, the Papal jurisdiction which it was sought to abolish is described in the preceding paragraph in exactly the same terms as this jurisdiction which was to be annexed to the Crown. It could not be more clearly stated that that is given to the Crown which had been taken from the Pope. And hence nothing could be clearer than that the Crown was constituted the fountain-head of whatever spiritual jurisdiction the National Church enjoys.

Lord Halifax's answer to this contention is by distinguishing between jurisdiction and jurisdiction.

All jurisdiction [he says] in the sense in which that word is very commonly used is not derived from the Crown, but only coercive jurisdiction. Spiritual jurisdiction, in the sense of spiritual authority which alone is able to bind the conscience, is derived from a very different source. It is the ignoring of this double source of jurisdiction that lies at the root of our present troubles.

And he quotes from Mr. Gladstone's letter to the late Bishop Blomfield, words to the same effect.

Jurisdiction is of two kinds—the one, which perhaps alone may be said to be jurisdiction at all, coercive in its operation, and, as such, the prerogative of the Supreme power in the State; the other—which, in this sense, is improperly so called—being purely spiritual, bestowed upon the Church and her Bishops by Christ. . . . Church authority, then, which had been in the Church from the beginning, to govern, decide, adjudicate, was a true self-governing authority; but it was not properly, in strictness of speech, jurisdiction.

This distinction, however, has no foundation in the Act of Supremacy; it is merely read into it; and it is here that we have the fallacy which has been described as vitiating Lord Halifax's entire argument for a milder view of Royal Supremacy. The fallacy lies in the word "coercion," which he and Mr. Gladstone understand of the coercion of corporal penalties only. It is the very essence of jurisdiction to oblige and hence to coerce; but the penalties threatening disobedience may be spiritual as well as corporal. Hence we find the great mediæval canonist Bracton using language the very opposite of what we have just heard. "There are spiritual causes in which the secular judge has no cognizance or execution, *since he has not coercive power*; for in these cases the cognizance pertains to ecclesiastical judges who rule and defend the priesthood."¹ The spiritual coercion is eked out by the spiritual penalties called "censures," but it is to be sought primarily in the judgments of God awaiting those who disobey their spiritual superiors.

As regards the composition of their present ecclesiastical Courts, it seem to us that Lord Halifax successfully makes out that his party have a grievance. It is not merely that the judges who sit on the Judicial Committee, unlike the previous Court of Delegates, are, except for the assessors, all laymen, and not necessarily laymen in communion with the Anglican Church,

¹ *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliæ*, Rolls Series Edition, ii. p. 171.

or of any definite faith. It is because even the Court of Delegates does not seem to have been originally intended to deal with the kind of Ritual cases which have lately been brought before the Judicial Committee. Lord Halifax notes that the kind of cases which, both before and after the Reformation and until recent times, exclusively occupied the attention of Official Principals, or Deans of Arches, were cases of importance only to the individuals—such as testamentary and matrimonial causes, or disputes about tithes or the tenure of benefices—but that suits for the correction of heresy or ritual were tried of old by the Bishops or Archbishops either *in camera* or in Synod. He quotes Bishop Stubbs as testifying that no appeals in cases of heresy were in the mediæval times allowed to go beyond the Archbishop, so as to be carried to the Pope.

On this last point Bishop Stubbs is certainly wrong. The truth is rather the other way. Except when the heresy charged was palpable and already decided by the Holy See, the Bishops would not have thought of deciding definitely for themselves. They would have referred the case to the Holy See as a *causa major*, and, if they decided it at all, would have given their own sentence provisionally. It was thus the English Bishops acted in the Wicliffe case. They first caused Wicliffe's writings to be examined by twelve theologians, and then on the report of these twelve condemned certain of his propositions in a Provincial Synod. But this condemnation, they tell us in writing to the Pope, was "saving always in all things the authority of your most Holy See, to which the declaration and final settlement of conclusions of this kind is known to belong."¹ They then ask the Pope to condemn and reprobate the propositions with Apostolic authority.

The Pope's authority being swept away, did the Reformation Settlement transfer the final appeal in such cases to the Crown, to be heard in some supreme Court of its own, or did it leave cases of heresy to be finally determined by the Bishops? The Act of Supremacy here occurs to the mind, for it speaks of matters "such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm with the assent of the clergy in Convocation." It may indeed be said that legislation, not judicial administration, is here contemplated. But if this view is taken it is difficult to say where we are to turn for evidence of how cases of heresy

¹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 350.

should be tried. The Court of High Commission undertook then as long as it lasted, and when it was abolished, no special provision for the need seems to have been made, the few cases which have since emerged having been referred to the Court of Delegates, rather in default of any other Court being provided than because it could claim them as belonging to it. In this absence of anything definitely provided we can only speak of what is desirable. Now it certainly does seem more natural that questions so essentially theological as those raised by recent Ritualistic controversy should be confided to the Bishops of the Anglican communion, rather than to a body of lawyers, however upright and however eminent in their own profession. To this extent, accordingly, it seems to us that the Ritualists have a grievance. Indeed it is recognized that they have, and one which would be remedied at once, were it not that the Nonconformists—apparently on the principle that the end justifies the means—use their influence in Parliament to obstruct all Church measures. It is satisfactory to know that Catholic members of Parliament do not take that ungracious line—although, by-the-by, at the time of Emancipation the enemies of that measure were quite confident that they would take it, whilst no similar fear was entertained in regard to the Nonconformists.

We come now to the particular judgments on Ritual question which the Judicial Committee has pronounced. Have these been in accordance with the ecclesiastical law as settled at the Reformation? It is with reference to the Ornaments Rubric that the question is chiefly raised, this Rubric, which may be found at the beginning of the Book of Common Prayer, running in the following terms: "And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the Reign of Edward VI." It is on this rubric that the Ritualists rely for the lawfulness of vestments, altar lights, and such like things; and yet the Ridsdale and Purchas Judgments decided that it could not be held to sanction their use. The Ritualist rejoinder has been that these Judgments were palpably unjust, and we know that, till Mr. Kensit stirred up the country, the practices they condemned were allowed to continue with impunity.

Unwelcome as the fact must be to the adherents of Mr. Kensit, it certainly does seem that historically and critically the

Ritualists have here the best of the dispute. The Rubric cited allows and prescribes the use of such ornaments of the Church and the Minister as were "in use by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI." Now, the second year of Edward VI. ended on January 27, 1549 (N.S.), and the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. passed out of Parliament on January 22, 1549, but was not to come into use till some months later. The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. was first issued in 1552, in the sixth year of the reign. Clearly then the Rubric, if its terms are to be taken in their natural meaning, cannot refer to this Second Prayer Book. At best they can be held to refer to the First, and some have not unnaturally claimed that use in the time precedent to the issue of the First Prayer Book must be meant, that alone being in use "in the second year of Edward VI." Still the Rubric speaks of use "by authority of Parliament," and it is difficult to find any Parliamentary sanction for use anterior to that introduced by the First Prayer Book. Accordingly, in the *Purchas* case, the Dean of Arches decided that the use of the First Prayer Book was intended. Now, this First Prayer Book unquestionably directs the use of two lights on the Altar to burn before the Sacrament, Copes or Tunicles, with Albs for the deacons when ministering, Vestments (*i.e.*, Chasubles) or Copes with Albs for the priests, and Mitre, Rochet, and Pastoral Staff for the Bishop. It directs the use of these, and it is fairly arguable that in directing these it does not mean to disapprove of stoles and maniples, and whatever else was usually worn with the vestments named. We seem then here to have distinctly sanctioned the substance of the usages which—so far as externals go—create the striking difference between the High and the Low Church type of Worship.

On what grounds then, we ask, have the recent Judgments decided otherwise? To answer this question we must pursue the history of this Rubric a little further. It first appeared in the Prayer Book of 1559, the first edition under Queen Elizabeth. In its place in the Prayer Book its wording was practically the same as at present, except for the absence of the phrase "or retained," which was added in 1662. But the Rubric was an extract from the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, and in this Act it is followed by the qualifying clause "until other order shall be herein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the great Seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or

of the Metropolitan of this Realm." The effect of this qualifying clause was to make the directions of the Rubric provisional, and the question arises whether "further order" was ever taken. The Ridsdale Judgment decided that it was, namely, by what are called Archbishop Parker's Advertisements, published in March, 1566. The general object of these Advertisements was to secure a certain amount of order and uniformity in the services—which the ultra-Puritans were carrying out wherever they could according to their own sweet will, with the result that (to confine ourselves to the point about vestments) "some say with a surplice, others without a surplice; some with surplice and copes, some with surplice alone, others with none." What the Advertisements ordered was that "in holy communion in Cathedral Churches the principal minister shall use a cope with epistoller and gospeller agreeably, and at other prayers to be said at that communion-table to use no copes but surplices;" and that in other churches "every minister shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves." Hence two controversies have gathered round these Advertisements, one already mentioned, whether they were the "further order" and superseded the Ornaments Rubric; the other, whether they are to be understood as merely enforcing the surplice in churches and the cope in Cathedrals—as the maximum which they could exact in view of the intense Puritan dislike for vestments of all kinds—or as prohibiting any other ornaments save these. The Ridsdale Judgment which decided that the Advertisements were "further order" decided also that their effect was both to enforce the surplice (and cope in Cathedrals), and to prohibit anything beyond these. The Ritualists maintain the contrary on both headings, and are severe on the Court for having, as they say, given a demonstrably unhistorical judgment. It is difficult not to feel that the text of the Advertisements, when viewed in connection with the known circumstances of the times, bear more readily the construction that their aim was to exact at least a modicum of ecclesiastical raiment, and not to prohibit any vestment previously allowed. So far then our opinion is distinctly that the Ritualists have the best of their opponents.

Whether the Advertisements were "further order," is more difficult to decide. All seems to depend on whether they emanated from the royal authority, or only from that of Archbishop Parker: another curious case of the paradox which so regularly attends Anglican domestic controversies, for

naturally one would have expected the Ritualists to attach importance to archiepiscopal, and not to royal mandates. However, we do not feel competent to decide this knotty point. We can only refer our readers to Mr. Parker's already mentioned tract, which gives the arguments for the Ritualist contention, and to Mr. Tomlinson's *The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies*. We will add that those who consult both books will probably agree with us that Mr. Parker would have done well in his sixth edition to reply to some of Mr. Tomlinson's criticisms. So far he seems convicted by Mr. Tomlinson of having left several points out of account.

But there is a further consideration of importance. In 1662, after the Restoration, when the Prayer Book was revised and a new edition authorized, the Ornaments Rubric was cast into its present form; that is, was repeated without any reference to Parker's Advertisement, or any clause to suggest that the arrangement sanctioned was still provisional. On the other hand, the word "retained"—"shall be retained and be in use"—was added, as we have already said. It is this new enactment of the Ornaments Rubric, in a slightly revised form and freed from all suggestions of transitoriness, which impresses us as the really powerful argument for the use of vestments. To re-enact in this way was surely to declare that, whatever might have been the effect of Parker's Advertisements till then, they were to be disregarded in future, and the use sanctioned in the First Prayer Book retained. One argument, we know, has been advanced on the other side, but it cannot claim to be of much weight. It is contended that by the insertion of this word "retained" the direction is limited to those ornaments only of the church and the minister, which were not only in use in the second year of Edward, but had continued in use up to 1662; and that from the contemporary accounts, copes and vestments are known to have disappeared and only surplices to have survived. But this surely is a forced interpretation. The word "retained" may just as well, or rather more naturally, signify retention among those prescribed by the Rubric. Of course it is a strange thing that a class of ornaments should be prescribed at a certain date, namely, 1662, and that we should find no traces at all of the prescription having anywhere taken effect. Still, if the letter of their law is distinctly on the Ritualist side, that would seem enough to justify a decision in their favour.

The foregoing is a brief account of the reasons for which

the Ritualists claim to be acting legally in maintaining their present ritual in their churches, and it is this case they propose to lay before the two Archbishops as soon as these inaugurate their new Court. Perhaps we ought to apologize for writing on such an extraneous subject in a Catholic magazine. But it may be of interest to some of our readers to know what lies beneath the present vivacious charges of disloyalty and counter-protests with which the air is filled. It may, too, enable some of our body to reflect before they join in these charges of lawlessness with the Nonconformists, who are acting, as they usually do, in utter ignorance of the facts, and from no very elevated motives.

There is one *caveat* we must enter before leaving the subject. The Ritualists may have some ground—we think they have—for claiming that their Church law favours these use of vestments and kindred ornaments. But there is nothing in their formularies which, rationally interpreted, can be held to sanction those doctrines for the sake of which all these ornaments are so tenaciously retained. It is in this sense that their Courts have invariably spoken when a doctrinal question was laid before them; and if the Ritualists decline to be bound by the Courts as at present constituted, at all events, they must have been painfully conscious of late how distinctly their Bishops, throughout the present crisis, have pronounced against the Objective Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It has been brought before them, too, of late—for instance, in the *Vindication*—that the occasional ambiguous passages to be found in the great Anglican divines of the past, never, as regards their doctrines, rose above the surface of Calvinism. How is it then that they can go on as they do? It is this that we find so hard to understand.

S. F. S

Otherwhere.

CHAPTER IX.

THE next morning when breakfast was over, Alé and Klemenké wandered into the western garden and seated themselves beneath the shadow of one of the great plane-trees. They were in happy converse together, happy at least on the part of Alé, who never tired of Klemenké's bright society. Klemenké was sad at heart, for she could at present see little prospect of returning to her own home; she was, however, far too kind to permit the pain which harrowed her own heart to cast its shadow over that of her friend. As well as this ever-present trouble, there was a second cause for anxiety hardly less painful, on which she could speak to no one. She was now quite sure that Sessos loved her, though with chivalrous courtesy he had endeavoured to avoid showing it. The most skilful of us cannot disguise our feelings beyond a certain point from an acute observer, and it was especially difficult to do this from one who in her innermost soul returned his loyal affection. Sweet as the illusion might be, the strangely unhappy circumstances which hedged her in on every side, seemed to make the hope unreasonable, that her bright dream of happiness would ever become a reality.

Klemenké was repeating to Alé one of Eklis's strange remarks, which at the time she heard it, in her own home at Avenka, had amused her very much, when a servant approached with a message from the Duke to Alé, saying that he wished to see her without any delay in the room of the knights. This was an apartment where the Duke was wont to shut himself up when he had letters to write, and where he held interviews with his people on matters of business. It had acquired its name long ago, from the tapestry covering the walls, which was adorned with representations of knights in combat with giants, ogres, dragons, and other monstrous creations of some forgotten romancer's brain.

Klemenké remained beneath the tree. She had said about a decade of her Rosary when Eklis approached her. From the moment she had become aware of his arrival, she had been certain that his visit was to her, but for obvious reasons it was prudent for her to let the sage select his own time for an interview.

"We are quite alone, your Royal Highness, I think," Eklis said, glancing around him so as to make himself absolutely sure that no third party should overhear their conversation. A needless precaution perhaps, as it was carried on in the lady's native tongue.

"No one is in this garden but ourselves," she said, signing to him to take a seat on her left hand.

"You know, I am sure, madam, that as soon as I was aware of what had happened, I should at once have come to give help, but I was in the North, in a land far beyond railways. Her Majesty's despatch has most unfortunately been long delayed, and then for reasons most important for your own safety, it was necessary that I should seek an interview with the Princess Fyné as I came through Kara," Eklis said.

"I suppose you have been told what has occurred, and how very near death I have been; had I not received the tenderest care, I must have died," Klemenké said.

"It is a sad misfortune," Eklis replied, very gravely, "but I am glad that your Royal Highness has become acquainted with these people and the Prince."

"I shall never be able to make the Queen or any one else understand how very kind every one has been. Had I been their own sister, the Duchess and Alé could not have been more devoted to me. One or other of them was with me night and day; they never left me for a moment, and you must bear in mind they have no idea who or what I am," she said.

"That is well. I have tried to make out what they think, but have not learned much. I am sure they imagine Avenka to be a very little place, surrounded on all sides by ice and snow. The ladies love you very much. They have both of them told me so. They are very dear people. There is no one out of Avenka more worthy of regard. They are so simple and transparent in their goodness," Eklis said.

"Yes, it does seem unfair, where so much kindness and far more than mere kindness has been shown, not to take them into my confidence, but it cannot be," she said, with a deep sigh.

"At present, it certainly must not be," the philosopher replied, "but the times are changing rapidly in more ways than I can explain. I do not despair of her Majesty welcoming all your friends at the Court of Avenka."

An incredulous smile passed over Klemenké's features. She did not reply.

"It is quite impossible, madam," Eklis said, "for me to conduct you home by the forest route. It could not be accomplished without letting the Princess Fyné know who you are, and then a claim would at once be made on her Majesty to acknowledge the Emperor as the over-lord of Avenka. You know that must end in war. If I endeavoured to smuggle you through privately, you would be in danger of outrage. That wretched creature, Chuchu, has agents all around, with ever watchful eyes."

"Then I understand you to propose for me to return the way I came," she said.

"Yes. It may be attended by some danger—probably not much. We cannot have the Duke's help, because as soon as your being here is known of at Kara, he will be ordered in the form of a request to send you there. If he disobeys, as I am quite sure he will, his dukedom will be in peril. His state may be invaded by all the power of that mighty Empire," the philosopher said.

"It is a terrible position," she replied, "occasioned by his fatherly kindness to me."

For some time neither of them spoke. At last Eklis said, "With your Royal Highness' permission, I will have some conversation with the Prince and the Duke, and then go at once by the forest way, which is safe for me, to have an interview with her Majesty."

"Do so," she replied. "I need not tell you that I am grateful to you for your attention."

"Pray do not speak to me, dear Princess, of gratitude. There is not a man in Avenka who would not gladly die to deliver you."

The conference was now over, so Klemenké arose, and walked slowly down the garden alley which led by the most direct course to the castle portal. Eklis's eyes rested on the retreating figure until it was hidden by the foliage. The reverential love which for a few moments lighted his commonly hard and sarcastic features would have been a lesson, could it

have been seen, to those who persist in judging the higher order of souls, by the manners they are compelled to assume for self-protection in the dull evil world in which so great a part of their lives has to be spent. Eklis had known the Queen and her sister Klemenké from their infancy. But few fathers have so deep and unselfish a regard for their own children as had this seemingly hard, sarcastic man of science for these good and beautiful daughters of Avenka.

Eklis remained for a few minutes arranging his ideas, and then went in search of the Prince, whom he found in conversation with a gentleman who had arrived but a short time ago from Kara. He was an Imperial messenger who had come with despatches for the Duke. Eklis knew him. He filled an important post, and unlike many of the officials attached to the Court, was a man of probity and honour.

"Do you return to-day?" Eklis inquired.

"Yes, in about three or four hours," answered the messenger.

"Have you a special train at your command?" Eklis inquired.

The messenger said that there was one awaiting his orders.

"Then will you give me a lift to Kara? I must see her Imperial Highness as soon as possible, on matters of great importance to the Empire," said the man of science.

The messenger consented very gladly. He had dreaded a long, tedious journey all alone, he was now by a happy accident supplied with a companion, who was regarded as one of the greatest of experts in the art of conversation.

Eklis soon joined Sessos, who told him that the ladies and the Duke were engaged, and that he had received a message saying, that if he and Eklis wished to ride, they must go by themselves.

"The very thing," Eklis exclaimed; "we will dispense with the ceremonial attendance of guards, just take Renos only, for the sake of holding our horses if we want to look at anything. Where shall we go? What do you say to the cavern once more?"

"The very thing," replied the Prince. So off they started.

"Do you know why I have visited the castle this time?" inquired the philosopher in a careless tone.

"No. A fancy has crossed my brain, but it is probably a mere illusion of the imagination. When we are deeply interested

ourselves we are wont to attribute our own feelings to others who are quite uninterested about a matter which is moving our whole soul," said Sessos.

"A very wise remark, but hardly a reply to my question," Eklis said.

"I trust it may be to try to restore this lady to her friends," the Prince said, very gravely.

"Your imagination is indeed leading you a nice gallop. How is it possible that I, with all the scientific work I have on my hands, and the additional burden—no light one, I assure you—of having to wait on the Princess Fyné whenever she requires some barbarous jargon interpreted to her, or help in learning some new branch of knowledge which she hopes may drive another nail into the coffin of what she calls superstition and I religious reverence, can attend to such very minor matters? Then, too, the Emperor has taken up the fancy of becoming a great poet, and uses me as a rhyming dictionary. I am really fond of science, for its own sake, as you have long known, and circumstances have forced me to become the lackey of these stupendously great people. Is it—I put it to your own common sense—reasonable to expect me to waste my time over the affairs of this errant damsel?" said Eklis.

"Yes, it is, poor thing. If you will not for her sake, I trust you will for mine," said the Prince, in urgent tones.

"Oh, that puts a new face on the matter. I have known you for years, and have received almost unbounded kindness from all the members of the house of Naverac; besides, like the rest of the world, I like to sun myself in Court favour, so if you take an interest in this girl's concerns I will do all I can, and I think, with your help, it is not unlikely that I may be successful; but tell me, why do you take so deep an interest in this unknown wanderer's misfortunes?" said Eklis.

The question was a very difficult one to answer. Eklis was, so far as Sessos then knew him, about the last person in the world that he would wish to take into his confidence regarding his feelings for Klemenké. The philosopher watched the Prince's face intently as they rode along, side by side, in silence.

"You are young. Permit me to take the liberty—I admit it is a great one—of cautioning you not to fall in love with that pretty young woman," Eklis said.

"Why not? You know well that it is by no means the uniform custom of the race to which I belong for its members

to ally themselves with houses which are royal. Klemenké is very good and magnificently beautiful," said Sessos.

"She is not bad-looking, as young women go, I admit, but that is hardly a sufficient reason for the only brother of one of the greatest rulers in the world paying his addresses to this young person, of whom, and of whose antecedents, no one seems to know anything. How would the King and the Princess Dymna regard this obscure wanderer if she were their sister-in-law?" subdued sarcasm playing over his features like summer lightning. After a long pause he continued: "I fear I have gone too far. If I have been offensive, pray forgive me. You know I must take great interest in your Highness's welfare. Can it be expected that I should do so in hers?"

Sessos was nettled by the man's pertinacious intrusiveness. Under other circumstances he would have made a tart, perhaps a bitter rejoinder, but he realized that the help of Eklis would be invaluable in any endeavour to restore Klemenké to her home, so he determined not only to avoid manifesting anger, but to show that he had the fullest confidence in his old friend.

"As I have revealed so much," he said, "it is but just both to the young lady and to myself, that I should tell you that no declaration of love has been made by me, and that I cannot think it possible that Klemenké, or any one else, except you, to whom I have made it known, can have the slightest notion of my regard for her. She is at present much in the position of a captive. She must never know until she is once more free among her own people."

"You have acted uprightly, in the way I felt sure you would act. Beautiful, holy Klemenké! she will be indeed a treasure to you if she ever become your wife," said Eklis, with high poetic feeling in his voice, such as Sessos never dreamt of hearing. "You have shown most unexpected confidence in me," he continued, gravely. "I will be equally open with you. I have come here on the present occasion for her sake alone. She is surrounded by dangers you cannot realize. I say nothing now but the one word—Kara. You cannot fail to understand me. No time must be lost, but before anything can be done, I must communicate with her people, and I cannot do this through the cave. I therefore leave here in the Imperial messenger's train to-day and shall return as soon as possible. Until I get back, let me beg of you, on no account to leave her. One other thing is important. The Duke must not know of our

design at present. It might bring him into serious trouble at some not far distant time. It is our duty to protect him as far as we can. A thunder-cloud is gathering, let us pray that it may not burst here on the head of one who is by far the noblest of the Emperor's many vassal-rulers."

They had now reached the cave; none of the wild men were to be seen. Sessos and Eklis entered, the latter making some careful observations, whether of a scientific nature or relating to the project of Klemenké's return, Sessos could not tell, and did not care to inquire.

As they rode homewards, both were very silent; at last the Prince said: "Can you, without a breach of confidence, tell me anything concerning Klemenké's people?"

"Her relations, you mean?" Eklis said. "Very little, probably nothing that she has not already communicated to Lady Alé. She has one brother and one sister. Her father and mother, both of them, died when they were very young. An aunt brought them up, a kind, motherly old lady of perhaps sixty, an active, happy creature, who rides on horseback yet like a girl of eighteen. She has one son, who is, of course, own cousin to the girl you are in love with. He is a soldier. A fine, active young man. As you are not blind, I need not tell you that they are of gentle blood. It is but justice to say, too, that they are just, God-fearing, Christian folk. Still, this is but a poor catalogue of excellences for the bride of a Prince of Naverac."

Eklis once more spoke in that sarcastic tone which was so irritating to Sessos.

"You are very premature," answered the Prince. "I have told you that I love Klemenké, but there is no reason for thinking that she loves me. It is highly improbable that one so much my superior in everything except the mere accident of birth should ever care for me."

While the above dialogue was going on, another conversation of a more painful kind was taking place within the castle. Our readers will call to mind that Alé had been summoned from a chat with Klemenké, to confer with her brother in the room of the knights.

"I have received a despatch from the Emperor, my dearest Alé," the Duke said. Alé's heart beat fast, for she knew that her brother would not have addressed her as "dearest," unless

he was very deeply moved. He loved his sister very tenderly, but it was not on ordinary occasions his way to be effusive in terms of affection.

"There is an enclosure from Fyné for you," he continued, "but do not read it until I have told you the contents of mine. It is a proposal for your marriage with the Duke of Stuttnos. I do not remember whether you have ever seen him. My wife and I know him well. In point of position it is a splendid alliance, perhaps the greatest you can ever hope to make, but you would be utterly wretched with him. He is a bad man in almost every way; one of the chief advisers of the Emperor and Fyné, and is urging them on to the ruin of the state. Of course the despatch is in the form of a request, but you know, dearest, as well as I, that it is in reality a command. Fyné has determined to unite all the great houses together by marriage ties, so that the whole of the states may be compelled to support her in any course which she may think well to pursue. I have been dreading something of this kind for a long time. It has been going on all around. At last the bolt has struck us. What is to be done?"

Alé could not speak. She threw her arms round her brother's neck, and wept upon his bosom.

"Calm yourself, darling," he said. "I will not sacrifice you for anything in the world. I know that if I do not, sooner or later, means will be taken to quarrel with me, and we shall be invaded by an overwhelming force, but I will not purchase my dukedom by the dishonour and death of my sister, for that is what it means for one such as you are."

She kissed him again and again, but for some time she could not speak. "Let me go to tell Klemenké," at last she gasped.

"Go if you like, Alé, but what can that poor girl say to you, that you do not already know. She will, however, give you sympathy, and that in all the sorrows of life is the surest help," said the Duke.

When Alé entered Klemenké's parlour, she found her alone, engaged on a delicate piece of silk embroidery. She was so overcome by what her brother had communicated, that it was some time before Klemenké could fully comprehend the situation. When she did so, anger for a time overcame all other feeling. It flashed forth from her features, and every movement of her frame showed the strong excitement under which she laboured. For a time she was like Alé, almost unable to express herself.

coherently. "Do you know whether Eklis has gone?" she asked, as soon as power of speech returned to her.

Alé could not answer her question. "Please ascertain at once—very much, perhaps everything, depends upon it," Klemenké said.

Alé left the room for the purpose of making inquiries. He had not gone. He and the messenger were to depart for Kara at three o'clock.

Klemenké wrote a few words in the tongue of Avenka on the first scrap of paper that came to hand. "Please have that delivered to Eklis," she said. "He will wait upon me, I am sure, the moment he receives it; and now, darling, come and sit by me and listen to what I say. You have been to Kara; I have not. That pleasure has yet to come for me. I trust it may not be very long delayed. I know of the devilish things that occur daily there, perhaps better than you do. You must resist this infamy to the last. What does your brother say?"

"He is very, very good. He says I shall not be handed over to this life, which is so very far worse than death, whatever happens, but it is so sad that for my sake he will have to sacrifice the dukedom, and all else he cares for. We have held it for eight hundred years, and we have lived together so happily, he is so kind; and then think of all his poor people handed over to the emissaries of the cruel, wicked Fyné. The King of Naverac will, I am sure, give us personal protection, but that is very little," poor Alé said.

"Will you do what I bid you, Alé? Will you obey me as I obeyed you when you thought I was dying? I can save you, and perhaps if you do as I tell you, it may render a service to the Duke also."

"Yes, indeed I will; you are so wise and good, so much better than I am," poor Alé sobbed.

"Sit by me until Eklis comes, then leave us for a few moments till I call you back."

The poor distracted Alé crouched at her friend's feet, while Klemenké toyed lovingly with her long dark hair.

Eklis had returned from his ride, the note was at once given to him, and, like a true philosopher, he promptly obeyed the summons. In a very few words, spoken in the tongue of Avenka, she explained what the reader knows already.

"She must fly with me," Klemenké said. "I would not leave any woman in a situation so terrible, and Alé is, as you know, very dear to me."

"Your Royal Highness need not dwell to me on the horror of the situation, or the duty of saving any woman from such a fate, and especially one so good and innocent as the Lady Alé, but I fear it may complicate matters. Your Royal Highness may probably hasten that catastrophe which her Majesty has long feared to be imminent, but whatever happens, we must follow the right course."

"Cannot you see the Princess Fyné to-night, or to-morrow, and make her understand that Lady Alé is now too ill to leave home at present? This is strictly true, and we shall thus gain time," said Klemenké.

Eklis assented, and Klemenké went to call back Alé.

"You said you would do as I told you. Eklis and I have worked out a plan by which you will be quite safe. Before this happened, I had arranged to leave here very soon—no matter how, you shall know the details afterwards. You must fly with me. I am quite sure all my people will be very glad to see you," said Klemenké to her friend.

"But my poor brother," Alé exclaimed; "what will happen to him if I enrage Fyné!"

"On that matter, Lady Alé, it is at present premature to speculate," said Eklis. "I know your brother far too well to believe that under any circumstances he would ever hand over his sister to the fate that is threatened. Fyné, and the evil people who serve her, would be much more enraged if he would not obey orders, but persisted in keeping you here in his castle, when bidden to deliver you up, than they can be when they find you have burrowed into the earth like a mole in company of an evil spirit passing off as a woman."

Eklis added the last few words to what he really had to say, in the hope of diverting Alé for a few moments from her own grief, but her poor heart was far too fluttered for her to have retained any of her usual sense of the humorous.

"If you chance to see any of my relations, you may tell them to expect Alé as well as myself, and that we shall set out as soon as possible," Klemenké said, addressing Eklis.

As she spoke the bell sounded for luncheon.

Alé was too much disturbed to appear in the hall. The Duke and Duchess were evidently pre-occupied. On Klemenké, Sessos, and Eklis devolved the duty of keeping up such conversation as there was.

When Klemenké returned she found her unhappy friend

far calmer. The conversation that had passed had inspired hope.

"What a wonderful creature you are, Klemenké. Till to-day I have always thought you a perfect type of sweet, retiring gentleness, but now you are like the war-goddess—I forget her name—that they worship at Kara. I never saw even Fyné herself have a manner more commanding," said Alé.

"Is there not a sufficient reason? Then remember I told you that the women of Avenka, as well as the men, are trained to arms. Perhaps I may have got some of the rough manners of a soldier clinging to me. When I get you safe in my own home, I will try to retrieve some of those retiring habits which have made you so fond of me. I am not a prophetess like the poor woman who wished to kill me, but I have a persuasion that this catastrophe which troubles us all so much now, will in the end be for the advantage of the Duke as well as your own," Klemenké said.

"No, no," exclaimed the poor, desponding girl, "sooner or later this must be my brother's ruin. There is no power in the world equal to that of Kara, not even Naverac, and that is far away over the sea."

CHAPTER X.

As Eklis journeyed towards Kara in company with the messenger, he gathered that the Emperor had been told of Klemenké's arrival at the castle, and that she was thought to be an evil spirit which had assumed human form. Whether he was silly enough to believe this, his informant could not tell. All he knew was that he had received the Imperial instructions to make inquiries, and send in a report to head-quarters. It is needless to say that Eklis, though careful to communicate as little as possible relating to Klemenké, did nothing to encourage a folly so outrageous. The messenger left Eklis under the impression that the Emperor was about to have an interview with some of the wild people, as soon as his own report had been sent in.

Eklis, though believed not to be a native, had long been a trusted adviser of the Court; his knowledge of foreign countries was of the utmost service. He had rooms near the palace, so that he might be at hand when wanted. No sooner had he

arrived, than he communicated to Fyné his desire for an audience.

Fyné's residence was not in the Imperial palace ; it was a building of almost equal magnificence, standing isolated a little to the north, but only separated from the abode of the Emperor by a narrow stretch of turf, a little branch of the harem gardens. The Emperor would have preferred Fyné to have taken up her abode in the palace, but she had good reasons for declining to accede to such an arrangement. As a sovereign in her own right, the hereditary Princess of Norendos, it was needful for her to have a Court of her own. As the heir of the Empire and a friend and much trusted adviser of the Emperor, she could but rarely reside, as she persuaded herself was her wish, among her own brave and uncorrupted Northern people, but she kept those of her own country and race about her, and thus governed Norendos with energy, ability, and, we may add, with justice.

When Eklis presented himself, he was shown into an apartment which he had not seen before. It was a rather large room, but in no sense of magnificent proportions ; evidently it had been quite newly furnished. The style was plain, even to simplicity. There were some rich modern carvings, but little to attract attention, except a series of beautiful modern landscape views in her own mountainous northern land. In the place of honour over the fire-place—for fire-place there was, though artificial heat is seldom required at Kara, hung a small miniature, in a frame set with pearls and rubies, the outer rim being a blaze of diamonds. Eklis, who had visited many Courts, thought that he had never seen a picture so magnificently garnished. Ere he had completed his examination of this beautiful work of art, the door opened, and he was in the presence of her who was reputed to be the true ruler of this mighty Empire. Report had not exaggerated the beauty of the Princess Fyné. Of commanding height and rich proportions, with a wealth of long golden hair which she wore as nature had intended, in long and graceful waves, falling far below her waist, no one could be in her presence without feeling that the being before him was morally severed from the struggling and wearied humanity which forms so great a part of the world in which we live. Steadfast purpose and calm self-possession shone forth in every feature. It was a beauty of the mind far more than of the body, so transcendent was it, that those who loved her not felt

compelled to acknowledge her sway. Her dress was simple; a long white robe girt around the waist with a crimson scarf, the ends of which were fringed with ermine. She wore no gems, no ornaments of any kind. There was nothing whatever except her own surpassing majesty to distinguish her from any one of the ladies of her Court.

"I am so glad you have come. I am always glad to see you, Eklis, but now especially so, for I have a multitude of questions to ask and inquiries to make. I know you will tell me the truth. Is Lady Alé really ill?" she said.

"Yes, your Imperial Highness, that she certainly is. I saw her yesterday, and am sure she is unfit to travel," replied Eklis.

"So far well; now can you tell me, without breach of confidence, what are her own views and those of the Duke, as to the very splendid alliance which I have arranged for her," Fyné said.

"I am not trusted with any message, madam, but I apprehend that it is distasteful to her. The Duke has never said a word to me on the subject," replied the philosopher.

"This is inconvenient—most unfortunate," the Princess replied, "for more reasons than I can explain. We all have our predilections and antipathies, and so very few people are willing to sacrifice themselves for the sake of duty. Surely, the welfare of Kara is of more importance than a girl's prepossessions. Can she not be made to understand that for the sake of the Empire, and, what she no doubt values far more, for her brother's sake, personal predilection ought to be—must be, sacrificed?" She smiled as she spoke, and her features bore an expression of almost childlike wonder.

"I fear the Lady Alé, madam, is quite ignorant of those political principles which weigh so much with those who have the care of empires."

"This is more perilous than I can explain," Fyné continued, with great earnestness of manner. "Were I ruler here, you know me too well to believe that I would compel any woman, and especially the pretty, gentle Alé, to marry one she did not love; but as I have so often told you before, my power is very limited. I have none whatever when the Emperor sets his mind on anything. Then it has to be done, whatever objections I may see to it. He made these arrangements with the Duke of Stuttnos without consulting me, and has continued to insist

on them contrary to my advice, and so poor Alé must be sacrificed. I am very sorry." Her tone of voice and expression showed that she spoke from the depths of her heart.

"Let us change the subject," she continued. "What is all this rubbish about a spirit-woman staying with the Duchess?"

"Rubbish you may well call it, madam," Eklis replied. "It is only a wild fancy of those savages who live in the mountains. They saw a young girl whom they did not know, came to the sage conclusion that she was a bad spirit, and therefore very nearly murdered her. The Duchess and Lady Alé have taken care of the poor thing, that is all," said Eklis.

"Not quite all," replied Fyné, directing on him a scrutinizing gaze. "She did come through some rock-passage into the cave, and is a woman of quite extraordinary beauty, we are told. I think you will confirm this."

"Certainly, madam, she belongs to a people, a tribe I may perhaps call them, who live at a place named Avenka. I know her very well," said Eklis.

"How is it then we have never heard of this place?—Avenka you call it. Her people must be feudatories of ours," said Fyné.

"Who can tell the names of the septs of the forest folk, scattered as they are over an area so vast? I am sure I cannot, who am more familiar with their country than any one, except perhaps some of those wretched slave-hunters," he said. The position was one of extreme difficulty; he therefore spoke with assumed carelessness. Fyné saw through the ruse.

"You are not telling me all you know," she said, in a very serious tone. "I would not ask you to betray the confidence that she or any one else may have reposed in you, but for the girl's own sake, I ought to know the truth. She is in great danger."

"Your Imperial Highness has always the right to the fullest confidence from me, but I am in a position of some difficulty. It was by mere accident that this poor girl—dying, as it was then thought—had to be taken to the Duke's castle. I have promised to do all I can to secure her safe return. I dare not risk taking her through the forest lands, for we must then pass through Kara. I dare not bring this unfriended child of what we may call the wilderness here, for sad reasons, the gravity of which your Imperial Highness knows even better than I do. I live in terror, that before I can secure her safety she may be snatched away from her kind protectors," said Eklis.

"I fear she will be. The position is too terrible to contemplate, and I am powerless, quite powerless," said the Princess, fiercely.

"I have received protection and favour from her people, when I have been on your Highness' service. If she come to harm or suffer insult, they will attribute it to your Highness and myself. They cannot be made to comprehend the true state of things here," Eklis said.

"Who can except ourselves, who have to live and do our best in this hot-bed of corruption?" replied the Princess, something little short of misery written on her countenance.

Eklis paused for some time seemingly wrapped in thought. At length he said, "Cannot your Imperial Highness suggest some way by which I may save this poor child of nature without forfeiting your Highness' favour?"

"You cannot forfeit my favour, for the selfish reason that you are the only person I can trust without reserve, but I fear I am powerless to hinder his Majesty from sending for this poor thing. His curiosity has been aroused by the stories this wretched witch-woman has told him," she said.

"Cannot the matter be delayed for a few days? Not only my own life, but what I value far more, that of your Imperial Highness' may depend on it. This girl is a person of distinction among her own people. Any injury or insult to her would, I am sure, be mercilessly avenged," said Eklis.

"I think I may safely promise to do this, but there is only one way—a way I detest. I must appeal to the abject superstition of my cousin. He will not listen to me when I tell him not to do this, because it is intrinsically evil and very cruel. It is midsummer-time. I will cause him to be told that he will offend the great gods if he sends for her until after their great festival is concluded," she said, in a tone of the deepest scorn.

"That will give me a week," Eklis said.

"Longer. I can make it a little longer. It is only a matter of a present or two to those who get up the shows, and they will find some reason for lengthening them out; besides, how it will please the rabble. Then, too, you must remember that the calendar these idol priests go by, is four days later than ours, who know something of astronomy," she said.

"The time will be fully sufficient," Eklis replied, "if we were but certain the Emperor will consent to any delay at all."

"Of that you may rest satisfied," she replied. "I have

promised to go in state, accompanied by all the ladies of my Court, in the Emperor's procession to honour the national gods, and I shall tell him I dare not offer incense on their altars, or even enter the temples, unless he will undertake to delay sending for the girl until the last rites are over. He does not mind doing what we know to be horrible, but is in mortal dread of offending these imaginary beings. When, too, he hears me, as he shall do, talking as if I gave credit to his wretched superstition, he will be so delighted, he will promise anything. For a few days I shall stand as high in his regard as Chuchu," she said.

"The infamous miscreant," exclaimed Eklis; "some terrible fate will overtake the wretch."

"So I, too, should hope if I did not know too well that there is no order, no moral government in this wretched chaos. Oh, if I did but believe, as you say you do, that it is indeed a cosmos!" As she spoke, her face became overshadowed by an expression of anguish it was terrible to witness. In a few seconds she aroused herself from what seemed to have been a dream of agony, and her glorious dark eyes rested lovingly on the jewel-enshrined miniature. When she withdrew them she was once more able to talk calmly on affairs of state. For some time she questioned Eklis regarding political affairs, with which we have no concern. At length she recurred to Klemenké. "The Emperor's curiosity is excited," she said; "you must make some sort of arrangement, so that sooner or later he may see this prodigy. If we have but time, her protection may be secured—after all, there are some remains of decency and civilization yet left in Kara. I confess, too, that I am curious to see this maiden who passes through miles of mountain limestone, as electricity runs along a wire. The daughter of a land I never heard of."

"Time is everything, madam. She herself has told me that she is anxious to see the glories of Kara. I take it for granted that it is your intention, whatever may or may not be as to the proposed marriage, that sooner or later the Lady Alé shall pay homage to the Emperor."

"Certainly; but whatever Alé's feelings may be, the marriage must take place. You do not know how I pity her, for the Duke is very unamiable, not to use a stronger word; but the Emperor considers that there are overwhelming reasons of state for the alliance," said the Princess.

"Then this Avenka girl who has become a friend of Lady

Alé's, would, I apprehend, be quite safe if she came in her train?" said Eklis.

"Certainly she would," said Fyné. "Alé will probably stay in my palace. I must make things as little miserable for the poor girl as I can."

"Then I will promise on this girl's behalf, that she shall accompany Lady Alé, but the Emperor must give her a protection, as he has done to me. She is a Christian," said the philosopher.

"Certainly, certainly. All these laws against your superstition are very silly, but the rabble will have them. When anything goes wrong in heaven or earth, they always blame the poor Christians for it. I am very much ashamed of myself for the part I have had to take in punishing them," she said.

Eklis rose to depart, but Fyné detained him. "You have to pass the harem gardens," she said. "There is a tall, good-looking slave-girl there, No. 31. Her name is Britna. She is a Christian. Have you happened to notice her?"

"I have seen but never spoken to her," Eklis replied. "It is too horrible for me to think of such a fate as hers befalling a Christian maiden. Would to God I had the means of delivering her."

"That cannot be, but you may do her a very real kindness," Fyné said. "In the festival which is approaching, she, as the tallest and handsomest of the harem girls, will be required to offer the incense to the gods of Kara. I fear she may refuse. You are known to be a devout Christian. If you told her how very silly she is, she will probably do what the Emperor requires. If she refuses, I shall be compelled to order her to be scourged, and if she still persists, she will be thrown to the wild beasts. You know what happened to the other two girls, who the fools here think made the great storm. Will you try to induce her to use her common sense?"

Eklis did not speak for some time. His mobile features showed that a fierce conflict was raging in his breast. At length he said: "I cannot, madam. If it be really as you say, she must suffer as the other poor martyrs did."

"I did not think you were so heartless, Eklis," Fyné exclaimed, her face flushing with anger. "You are as cruel as that wretched Chuchu. She is but a slave; but would you really sacrifice even her to your superstition?"

"Yes, madam, I would; but let me buy her of the Emperor. I will pay anything demanded into the treasury, and distribute

far more than her value in the slave-market to Chuchu and his gang, as well," replied Eklis.

"It cannot be thought of, you cruel man. The Emperor has determined to break her spirit. He sees something he calls poetry in gaining the victory over a superstition which he does not chance to believe in," she said.

"Poetry there may be, but not where he thinks. I have heard of the girl. She will not give way. Tell the Emperor to try with me: I am far more likely to renounce my faith under torture than that poor slave is. Pray find some means of sparing her, madam. God will reward you if you do," said Eklis, with deep emotion.

"It cannot be," said Fyné, imperiously. "I thought you would help me, and you will not. After all, what does it matter? she is only a slave, and there are reasons why it is as well to be rid of her. Her fate will deter others from insubordination." She held out her hand, which Eklis pressed reverentially to his lips.

As Eklis walked slowly across the garden he saw standing near one of the fountains Britna, the slave of whom Fyné had been talking. She was a magnificent, stately creature, as tall and nobly proportioned as the Princess herself. He could not bear to permit his eyes to rest on the poor girl, who, he felt certain, was doomed to torture and a death of sickening horror. As he passed he made the holy sign as a mute encouragement to constancy. It was all he could do. Little, very little as it was, it sent a gleam of comfort through the unhappy creature's heart.

Fyné, from the passion-flower shaded balcony, watched the departure of Eklis. His mute encouragement to Britna did not pass unnoticed. "What a horrible superstition Christianity is," she thought. "Eklis is encouraging that creature to defy us—strange perversion of the intellect in the greatest philosopher of our time, and yet he is the only man in Kara, except my own Norendos guards, that I dare rely upon if a reverse of fortune were to overtake me, and most of them believe this same nonsense as he does—well, if No. 31 be thrown to the wild beasts, it will be his fault, not mine."

As these thoughts were passing through her brain, her eyes once more sought the ruby-encircled picture, and then she wondered whether, had her dear sister Elne lived and been in her place, she would have sent innocent maidens to die in the amphitheatre, just to please the rabble.

Reviews.

I.—THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE SHANG HAI MISSION PRESS.

FROM the days of Father Kircher's *China Illustrata* down to our own it may be said that literature and science in the far East have owed their chief developments to the efforts of Catholic, and we may add, Jesuit missionaries. It was through such men as Fathers Matthew Ricci and Adam Schall that the first glimmering of European learning penetrated into the Celestial Empire. It was also through the reports sent home by them and their companions that a beginning was made of something like a scientific study of Chinese antiquities and Chinese institutions, on the part of European scholars. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century the condition of affairs has, no doubt, undergone considerable modification. Both historical and commercial interests have led to the literature of the country being studied by many who have no official connection with any form of Christianity. But it is pleasant to be able to say that the successors of the old Jesuit missionaries who now direct the Catholic printing establishment at Shang Hai, are still foremost in the good work of bringing China and Christian Europe into closer relation. They are doing for the Mongol people of the far East what the University of Beyrout and the admirably organized press connected with it have long been doing for the Semitic races of Western Asia. Not only are they creating for the use of the natives quite a large library of Christian literature, adapted or translated from French, English, and Italian, but they are earning the gratitude of European scholars by an important series of monographs on various matters of scientific interest connected with China. The most considerable of all these literary efforts is one specially worthy of the religious brethren of Father Athanasius Kircher. That same wonderful Chinese and Syriac inscription of the eighth century at Si-Ngan-Fou, which was published for the first time more than two hundred and fifty years ago, in *China Illustrata*, is now appearing, accompanied by facsimiles, com-

mentary, translation, and notes, under the able editorship of Father Havret, S.J. For centuries the famous stele was believed to be nothing more than a pious figment invented by the Jesuits, but its authenticity is now guaranteed by scholars of every shade of opinion. Besides this important work, one instalment of which is still anxiously expected, we have now before us four of the most recent publications of the series of *Variétés Sinologiques* and the kindred *Études Sino-Orientales*.

The first we have to notice belongs to the latter collection and consists of an able little monograph on the Lolos by M. Paul Vial,¹ a secular missionary in Yun Nan. It deals succinctly with the history, religious beliefs, manners and customs, language and script of a curious race, subject to the Chinese, first known to Europeans through the narrative of Marco Polo. As compared with their Chinese conquerors, Father Vial has formed a very favourable impression of the moral character of this timid and retiring, but not unmanly people.

A more learned and bulky though less popular brochure is that of Father Hoang, upon Chinese property law.² Its importance is attested by the fact that the first rough draught which was issued by the author as far back as 1888 was subsequently printed in English in the *Journal* of the China Board of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xiii. The work as it now appears is considerably augmented and thoroughly revised. It is, we can well understand, a most useful manual for all foreigners who contemplate making any sort of settlement in China.

The same learned missionary is also responsible for another considerable volume on the Chinese marriage law.³ Like its predecessor it is founded almost entirely upon official documents, and it contains many interesting details which are valuable not merely to those who labour among the Chinese people themselves, but also to folk-lorists and statisticians in all parts of the world.

Lastly, we may notice an erudite little historical work

¹ *Les Lolos, Histoire, &c.* Par Paul Vial. Shang Hai, 1898.

² *Notions Techniques sur la Propriété en Chine.* Par le P. Pierre Hoang, 1897.

³ *Le Mariage Chinois au point de Vue Légal.* Par le P. Pierre Hoang. Shang Hai, 1898. The same Father has also published an interesting legal study, illustrated with elaborate maps, on the Chinese Salt Trade, salt being a contraband and a great source of revenue.

dealing with a remote period of Chinese history by Father Albert Tschepe, S.J. Like all those which we have mentioned, it is well written, well printed, and equipped both with illustrations and maps.¹

Let us also call attention to the scientific publications of the Observatory of Zi-ka-wei, notably to one published in English by Father L. Froc, S.J., and entitled *Typhoon Highways in the Far East*. It is obvious that the well-appointed meteorological station which the Fathers have established there at a short distance from Shang Hai is likely, apart from purely theoretic results, to render important services of a practical kind to those who navigate the adjacent waters.

With regard to pecuniary resources, the Mission Press of Shang Hai has to fight a most unequal and uphill battle against the richly subsidized Protestant printing establishments which in many ways hamper its progress. The great desire of the Catholic missionaries is that their literary work should become better known to European scholars. If only the knowledge of it could be more widely spread, the rest might fairly be left to its own intrinsic merits. Even as it is the progress made is marvellous, but we will conclude by begging our readers to do anything that may be in their power to make these really admirable publications better known to all interested in China and the Chinese. Perhaps the most likely to be generally useful of all the works hitherto taken in hand by the Mission Press is one now on the point of appearing under the direction of Fathers Henri Havret and Gabriel Chambeau, and entitled, *Manuel du Sinologue*. It is in a word a "Chinese Reader," having special reference to the history and antiquities of the country, and edited with great care by two scholars who possess a quite exceptional acquaintance with Chinese literature.²

2.—THE CHILD OF GOD.³

Teachers, like poets, are born and not manufactured; whether systems of training may notably develop the teaching-faculty where it is latent has yet to be proved; but that they can never

¹ *Histoire du Royaume de OU*. Par le R. S. Albert Tschepe, S.J. 1896.

² The publications of the Mission Catholique de Shang Hai may be procured from Kelly and Walsh at Shang Hai, or from Arthur Savaète, Bookseller, Paris.

³ *The Child of God; or, What comes of our Baptism*. By Mother Mary Loyola, of the Bar Convent, York, author of *First Communion*. Edited by Father Thurston, S.J. London: Burns and Oates, 1899.

create it, is beyond all doubt. The author of *The Child of God* is a born teacher who probably has discovered and improved her talent by experience and practice, quite independently of any psychological training. We venture to guess that she would give as poor an analysis of her own method as the play-wrights gave to Socrates of theirs. Indeed, her strength is in her unconsciousness; in the measure in which she begins to reflect, she will most likely begin to fail. When the public commends certain characteristics of an author's work, his next volume will be sure to exaggerate them out of all proportion. Hence, in so many cases, the first product is scarcely equalled by the succeeding.

The child-mind is hard to get at, save for those who retain it to some extent. Not that it is ever wholly put off; but only over-laid and pushed down to the depths of our sub-consciousness—lost as one voice in a chorus. Some have skill to single out that voice, and to shut their ears to the rest, and these are the teachers of youth, who can speak to the child in its own language and philosophy. Imagination, sympathy, inventiveness, experience—when these can be taught, teaching can be taught; till then, one might as well try to purchase the Holy Ghost with money.

To those who underestimate the difficulty of simplicity this book may seem ordinary enough; to ourselves it seems, on second reading—not faultless indeed, far from it—but by no means ordinary. It is professedly an attempt to bring home to young children the principles of the fundamental Exercises of St. Ignatius—to interest them in that in which it is so hard to interest the mature mind of their elders; to make them face the great questions of man's whence and whither; to realize the relation of creaturehood with all its consequences; to turn their gaze from without, inwards, and to enter upon the endless quest of self-knowledge. No light task indeed, when we realize that all this truth must be "embodied in a tale," if it is in any wise to enter in at the lowly doors of wakening reason. But what lightens it for the author is her singular power of concrete presentment, of direct and vigorous illustration, of vivid pictorial description. She disdains nothing, almost stops at nothing, in her single strong will to make the truth pass intact from her own mind into the child's. She knows well the world of that little mind with its brief narrow experience; the simple objects and familiar figures of which its symbolism is constituted.

The language she uses must be the child's, and not her own ; and it is precisely in the easy adaptation of a medium so limited to the expression of so large a theme, that the creative power of her art is shown. We do not say that there are no passages where, for a brief moment, her own interest in the matter makes her forgetful of her auditory, where, soliloquizing, she lapses into her own language, and takes the serious tone of preacher or prophet, to the possible bewilderment of the little listener ; but on the whole, the smile is never off her face ; and a certain hilarious playfulness which delicately hovers above the depths of seriousness, makes the occasional ducking beneath the surface seem an episode rather than the principal end in view.

Whatever can be conveyed by story and parable is so conveyed ; and thus the didactic and expository passages are as few and brief as possible, serving only as connective tissue ; or if they are long, an illustration is shot into the texture to break the monotony. For example, during a rather lengthy explanation of grace,¹ she is sensitive to a gathering shadow of weariness on the child's face, and dispels it with a lightning-flash of illustration :

This gift is grace. It was a gift so great that all His other presents to them were as nothing compared with it, and so He told them that rather than part with it they must be ready to lose everything else. "Your money or your life !" says the highwayman, as he darts out upon the lonely traveller and points the revolver at his breast. At once everything is handed out, watch, money, valuables of every kind—all must go where there is question of saving life, the life of the body. All must go, pleasure, comfort, friends, health, the life of the body itself, to save the life of the soul which is the grace of God.

Again, she has the secret of giving an unexpectedly familiar turn to truths not altogether familiar, and thus suddenly driving them into the imagination. "Why then did God make me ?" because "He wanted to see the delight on my face throughout eternity."² "We sometimes hear people say they do not like machine-work. Neither does God."³ "Soon I shall be kneeling at His feet, holding up my work, saying to Him, Lord, are you satisfied ?"⁴ Arrows of this kind fly out of every page.

Luxuriance, however, has its dangers and needs pruning ; the very abundance of the author's energy is the cause of most of her defects. Faber, who has given us a few of the very best

¹ P. 60.² P. 26.³ P. 26.⁴ P. 30.

of our hymns, has also given us many of our very worst ; and some would dare a like criticism on Wordsworth's poetry. Those who write by instinct are apt to be unwisely impatient of rule and convention, and to take literary liberties which are tolerable only when justified by extreme necessity. Our author's exuberance carries her at times beyond the bounds of freshness and freedom into a sort of reckless license that flings out anything anyhow, just as it rises up in the mind ; and thus the charm of restraint is gone, and the sense of that dignity which saves simple condescension from degenerating into hurtful familiarity. We can play with children without romping with them.

Only in one or two places are we offended by those pious unrealities, which are the bane of "good" books for the young. That St. Aloysius fainted over venial sins, and that St. Macarius wept all his life over a stolen fig, even if facts in any sense, are facts so remote from any state of mind we have experience of as to seem ridiculous and fabulous. Nothing but harm can come of such exaggerations.

But in general the moral teaching of the book is delightfully sound and virile ; for example the excellent treatment of the passions on page 172. And then, having already noticed very acutely¹ that the play of children is not like the play of kittens, mere animal friskiness, but is invariably a mimicry of responsibility—"What we liked was the feeling of *being responsible*"—the author gives the following excellent counsel,² which will serve to bring these remarks to a close :

No one then wants to quarrel with you for holding up your heads as children of Britannia who rules the waves. On the contrary, the more you think about your freedom and the responsibility it brings, the better.

"Responsibility for being free?"

Certainly, the two things go together as light and shade. All God's gifts bring responsibility with them. The greater the gift, the more responsibility. Now free-will is His greatest gift, so of course we have to answer for the way in which we use it. But why do you suppose we care so much about our freedom and fight for it so hard?"

"Because we stand up for our rights, and freedom is our right."

Very good, and why is it our right?

"Because God made us free. He made us all free."

And so we not only take care of our own liberty, but we will not tolerate slavery anywhere. If an English ship catches sight of

¹ P. 45.

² P. 166.

a slaver off the coast of Zanzibar, she gives chase and boards it, and frees the poor captives there. No, we cannot tolerate slavery :

Slaves cannot breathe in England ; if their lungs
Receive our air, that moment they are free ;
They touch our country, and their shackles fall.
That's noble, and bespeaks a nation proud
And jealous of the blessing.

One word of praise may be added for the illustrations. The two designed for the book by Miss Padbury are in every way excellent.

3.—THE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF BISHOPS.¹

Dr. Wirgman is anxious to persuade his co-religionists in the Church of England that the authority of its bishops is, as at present exercised, unconstitutional, because they have neglected the principle of Primatial and Patriarchal authority. He believes in "the historic Primacy of Christendom," which is situated at Rome. But neither this, nor the authority of Primates over lesser areas, is taken into account by the ordinary Anglican theories of ecclesiastical authority. "The many Anglican authorities who admit to the full the Primacy of St. Peter, do not see with equal clearness that the principles involved are necessary to Church unity in every Province and in every Patriarchate of the Catholic Church."² It must not, however, be supposed that Dr. Wirgman in any way sympathizes with the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff. He perpetually asserts that he rejects this. We will accordingly point out one or two flaws in his reasoning, which will in part account for his position, premising, however, that we think it a distinct gain that an Anglican writer should be found to protest against the ordinary idea of provincial independence and national autonomy. First, then, Dr. Wirgman's method of proof is fundamentally erroneous. He deals with the scanty and difficult records on the subject of Patriarchal, Primatial, and Metropolitan organization in the earliest centuries with some fulness, considering the size of his book, but when he comes to the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, where we

¹ *The Constitutional Authority of Bishops.* By A. T. Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L. London : Longmans.

² P. 45.

might expect to see his subject still more carefully treated, and where there is very clear testimony to certain leading principles, Dr. Wirgman says, "Into the complex and chequered history of the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus it will not be necessary for us to enter."¹ And, "We close our inquiry with the Council of Chalcedon."² Now, the "inquiry" in this latter case occupies exactly five pages! And the Council of Ephesus fares even worse. Only one incident connected with the Cypriotes is mentioned, which occupies four pages. This, and the assertion that Cyril of Alexandria presided in place of the Bishop of Rome, constitute the whole account of the Council of Ephesus by an author who is perpetually objecting to the *Petri privilegium* as unhistorical. If Dr. Wirgman were to take those two Councils into account, he would have to ask himself, How is it that I find myself differing altogether from the Bishops at those two Œcumenical Councils as to the primitive relation of Christian Bishops to the Roman Pontiff? Next, Dr. Wirgman does not deal with the Papal theory in any serious way. He dismisses the Pope as "an unconstitutional despot"³ and "an infallible autocrat,"⁴ and on the same page he says very truly: "The fact that St. Clement does not call himself Bishop of Rome is no argument against his being so," and, very inconsistently, "He claims no personal *Petri privilegium* as centred in himself," using this as an argument against his possessing it.⁵ Thirdly, as an instance of what Dr. Wirgman attributes to Bellarmine and to Catholics generally, viz., "perversion of history," we may cite his interpretation of the second Canon of Constantinople (First Council), by means of which he explains the celebrated third Canon. He understands the "Eastern Bishops" in that Canon to be the "Patriarchs of Constantinople."⁶ They were the Bishops of the "Diocese" of Antioch.

4.—CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY: THE SOUL.⁷

In the little volume before us, the author confines himself to the specially metaphysical part of psychology—the establishment of the substantiality, simplicity, and spirituality of the soul, the connection between soul and body, and the nature of personality—which is rather unhappily termed *rational* psychology by

¹ P. 262. ² P. 266. ³ P. 11. ⁴ P. 53. ⁵ P. 63. ⁶ P. 256.

⁷ *Christian Philosophy: The Soul.* By the Rev. J. T. Driscoll, S.T.L. Benziger.

modern writers. We think he has done wisely in following this course; and he would have done better still, had he limited himself to even fewer questions and discussed them more fully.

The division and arrangement of the matter are clear and good. The chief defect is the excessive multiplication of names and systems, which will inevitably leave a bewildering impression on any reader who is not already fairly well acquainted with the subjects which the author expounds. Thus, the treatment of materialism contains much that is useful throughout the volume; but it would have been far more valuable if it had been all collected into one chapter, and grouped under the exposition and criticism of at most some one or two leading representatives of the sect. The chapter on Positivism seems to us the best and most useful in the volume, precisely because the author confines himself to the exposition and criticism of a single representative. The student will here be able to get a tolerably clear grasp of the subject, and will probably find that he has something definite in his mind to carry away.

On the other hand, the chapter on the intricate subject of Pantheism—the literature of which the author seems to have studied with care—is considerably damaged by the hopeless attempt to give within twenty small pages of large print, a history and exposition of the separate systems of Spinoza, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Hindu Brahmanism, Emerson, and the neo-Hegelian School, along with a refutation of them all. We fear that the student will be more dazed than enlightened by so summary a treatment of such difficult matter; and if tested afterwards by an examination-paper, he is as likely as not to ascribe the Upanishads to Emerson, and to suppose that Spinoza and Schleiermacher were connected with Brook Farm.

The chief merit of the book, in our eyes, lies in the fact that the author has acquainted himself with the modern literature of the subject, and does not confine himself to the time-honoured objections and solutions which have done such yeoman service in the Latin manuals, but seeks to expound and solve, though too summarily, the errors of the present day.

There is one serious blemish in the volume which should be removed from a second edition. The quantity of misprints in the form of false spellings of authors' names and of erroneous titles of books, is altogether abnormal. Quatrefages, for instance, is

spelt in three different ways, Comte is erroneously printed with a *p* throughout the entire volume, Herbart is confounded with Herbert; whilst even such familiar names as Schopenhauer, Moleschott, Feuerbach, Titchener, and even Dr. M'Cosh, come in for analogous ill-treatment. The ordinary reader of French, no less than the Abbé Farges himself, will be somewhat surprised to find that writer of choice French accredited with a work entitled, *L'acte et Potencie*.

5.—ROSES AND RUE.¹

Not the least remarkable feature in the world of literature to-day is the long list of women poets—Catholic English poets in great part—that confronts us. Mrs. Meynell, Rosa Mulholland, Katharine Tynan-Hinkson, and many more, are names with which we are familiar. They have done and are still doing good work; work of that peaceful, contented kind, which produces its fruit, no one, least of all the worker, knows how or where, bringing home to men a sense of the truth and reality of life, a keen appreciation of the working of God in man and in nature, and a higher enjoyment of the beauty of even this life, all which makes their readers' hearts feel grateful, and impels them to say that writers such as these have not lived and worked in vain.

And now another book has come, bringing with it the name of another worker to be added to the list. Miss Furlong's name is not unfamiliar to us, nor are her poems; we have seen many of them before in a well-known monthly. But, unless we are mistaken, this is the first time she has put her songs together, a convenient opportunity for offering our congratulations. For, certainly, her work deserves congratulation. From first to last it is true, and it is varied; true to life and to modern experience, varied alike in subject and in method.

She sings of nature and the seasons with Allingham. Passages like—

“Your will! Your will!” he saith the whole day long,

are remarkably like that author's work; she touches again and again on human love in the spirit of Patmore—notice especially the lines “My share of the world,” among which come—

¹ *Roses and Rue*. By Alice Furlong.

I would part with wealth and ease,
 I would go beyond the seas,
 For my share of the world !
 I would leave my hearth and home
 If he only whispered " Come ! "

Houseless under sun and dew,
 I would beg my bread with you,
 O my share of the world !
 Houseless in the snow and storm,
 Your heart's love would keep me warm.

In form, too, she is bold, and with happy result. The one blank verse poem in the volume, "God's Poem," is singularly effective ; and another, "In a lonely Land," written in the metre (?) of Walt Whitman, we would gladly quote at length did space allow.

Let us conclude this brief notice with one suggestion. Whether it be a reaction from the almost excessive refinement of Tennyson and his school, or whether it be an effect of the rougher but perhaps stronger school of Browning, there seems to be growing up a certain freedom of metre among our latter-day poets which scarcely existed half a century ago. From among leading names we would quote Stephen Phillips as particularly noteworthy. From time to time we notice in his lines a strange disregard of the ictus ; occasionally, too, a violence of contraction that is anything but pleasing to the ear. Names such as his may sanction the practice according to modern views ; if it does we can only lament the fact and be silent. But if harmony of sound is to be valued as one of the desiderata of good poetry, then surely we are justified in protesting. Occasionally, to our ears, Miss Furlong's lines run lamely, an apparently impatient effort to say what she has in her mind seems at times to impel her to a neglect of the form. What she says is always worth the best words and the best adornment she can give it ; why not then do her ideas full justice ? If we may suggest to her a model in this respect, we would quote another Catholic lady poet—Mrs. Meynell. Her words are never unworthy of their subject ; and her subject is always worthy of herself. Which remark brings us to the point from which we started, and we leave with congratulations to Miss Furlong on having joined this goodly company.

6.—THE PERSECUTION OF ENGLISH CATHOLICS UNDER
CHARLES II.¹

The author of this little work tells us that it was written in the hope of making her French readers better acquainted with one of the most striking episodes in the persecution of English Catholics—the sad story of the victims of the notorious Titus Oates. As a matter of fact, Madame de Courson has succeeded in tracing so graphic a picture of the dangers and sufferings of those evil days that many English readers also, we venture to think, will be glad to make acquaintance with this effective little history of the “Popish Plot.” It is not, of course, a work which makes any pretence to original research. Lingard, and Challoner, and Brother Foley’s *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, supply the great bulk of her materials, but it is one thing to copy slavishly the narrative of previous writers, and another to use their data as Madame de Courson has done and give them a new and attractive setting of her own. After briefly sketching the life and reign of Charles II., and telling the story of the Oates Plot and its authors, the remainder of the book is almost entirely devoted to the history of the martyrs—Jesuits, Benedictines, and others, who fell victims to the exasperation aroused in the public mind by the falsehoods circulated concerning the pretended Popish conspiracy. The sufferings of the fugitive priests, and the part played by the devoted Catholic laity, both men and women, in sheltering and relieving these confessors of the Faith, are recounted in detail. We wish we had space to give a few extracts, but we must content ourselves with expressing the hope that what we have said will induce our readers to procure the book for themselves. We can assure them that in the 320 pages or more of which it is composed, we have not found a single dull sentence; and that the amount of interesting information contained in it, not only concerning the persecutions, but about the more prominent historical personages of the time, the King, for instance, and his Queen consort, Catherine of Braganza, the Duke of York, afterwards James II., and others, might be looked for in vain in many far more pretentious

¹ *La Persécution des Catholiques en Angleterre—Un complot sous Charles II.*
Par la Comtesse R. de Courson. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1899.

volumes. The book ends with an Appendix, giving a short history of the Seminary at Douay, and of the College of the English Jesuits at St. Omer.

7.—THE CURÉ OF ST. PHILIPPE.¹

The Curé of St. Philippe is a novel of which the scene is laid among the French Canadians. The author has spent many years in their midst, and is able to draw a vivid and interesting picture of the life of this old-world race, which some one has called a survival in miniature of the France of Louis Quatorze. St. Philippe des Bois is the suburban district of a large town parish which has grown to need a church of its own. The Bishop of Richelieu appoints the Abbé Lalonde to be the new parish priest, and it is round his relations with his parishioners and his efforts to form the new parish that the story gathers. The mass of his flock are French Canadians, but there are some few Irish Catholics intermingled with them, and outside the Catholic circle is a growing population of English and Scotch descent, some of them of strong Protestant views. The life of the French Canadian element is patriarchal in its filial submissiveness to the rule of M. le Curé, in its old-fashioned manners, in its simple goodness and piety, and, of course, also in its narrowness. The chief representative of the Irish element, Mr. Patrick Marcellus Fitzgerald, is a practising Catholic, and good at heart, but somewhat of a trial to the Curé, whom he would like to take in charge, somewhat also of an intriguer, and with an ambition for municipal honours. A most objectionable character is Fisher, the Mayor of the township, a successful speculator who contrives by skilful corruption to attain to high office in the Dominion Parliament. In the earlier part of the book we are entertained by the manœuvring of these people, each bent on his own ends, and trying to utilize for them the Curé's project of building a church for the parish. And here we are introduced to a custom which it is curious to find still prevailing in a portion of the British Empire. When a new church is required, a majority of Catholic parishioners can by their vote legally "requisition" or tax the entire Catholic parishioners for the expenses, each having to pay in proportion to his property. The thought of such a system may make the

¹ *The Curé of St. Philippe. A Story of French Canadian Politics.* By Francis W. Grey. Digby Long and Co.

mouths of some of our much-trying priests water. But there is a seamy side to it. It tends to detach those whose Catholicity is weak and decadent. As the story advances we are given an insight into the secret history, as the author understands it, of the recent Manitoba School Movement, so far as it affected the general elections of 1896. On this part, being political, we will not dwell, except to say that it will be found instructive. This too may be said of the book as a whole. The story part is somewhat thin, but the pictures of Canadian life are interesting, and some of the characters are cleverly drawn. Bishop Perras is particularly good.

Literary Record.

I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

THIS is a year of jubilee to some of our principal London churches. The Oratory jubilee will be celebrated next month, the Farm Street will occur this year, and St. Mary's, Clapham, the church of the Redemptorist Fathers, kept its jubilee by a solemn *Triduo* last January. *A Half Century's Jubilee in St. Mary's, Clapham*, is a record of the event, and contains, after a short historical and descriptive Introduction, the four sermons which were preached in commemoration of the event. Perhaps it would be more correct to say three sermons so preached, for the sermon which heads the list was published shortly before, but accompanies the rest because it was Father Bridgett's farewell address to the people, preached last October, when he had already received the last sacraments. This by itself would suffice to give to the small publication a value not to be measured by its size. But each contribution evokes one's sympathy, and the whole sets before us a touching picture of quiet, unassuming, but solid and fervent work done for God, and increasing in volume during the half-century, until the twenty or thirty Catholics who, in 1849, used to hear Mass in the dining-room of the Fathers, have grown into a congregation of two to three thousand.

In *Cyril Westward* (Art and Book Company), Mr. H. P. Russell casts into story form a delineation of the present state of Anglican thought, with which, as a recent clerical convert, he

has had much experience. The attempt was so able that it deserved to succeed, and that it did is witnessed by the appearance so soon of another and cheaper—that is, a half-crown—edition.

A Business Guide for Priests (Benziger), is by Dr. Stang, Vice-Rector of the American College at Louvain. It contains much information which a priest with his experience yet to acquire may find of service in regard to the keeping of his parish-books. It is, however, written for American use, and many of the terms and forms are thus different from what we are accustomed to here.

British Rule and Modern Politics (Smith, Elder, and Co.), is by the Hon. Albert Canning. The writer's object is "to examine the results of British power and thought in promoting civilization," and for this purpose he sketches slightly the history of England and other nations, in regard to their domestic and colonial progress. He writes in a genial tone, but his examination does not yield any novel or striking results. There is, too, a great deal of repetition.

The Catholic Truth Society sends a life of *Monsieur Olier*, the saintly founder of St. Sulpice, by "the Rev. James Bellord," whom we are so soon to greet as Bishop of Milevis. It also sends us *A Life-long Battle*, a contribution to the Catholic's Library of Tales, of which it is sufficient recommendation to say that it is by Father Bampfield; *The Analogy between the mysteries of Nature and Grace*, a reprint of one of Cardinal Newman's sermons to mixed congregations; and *The Public Spirit of the Catholic Laity*. This last is the address delivered by the Bishop of Newport at the Catholic Reunion of Birmingham, on January 16th of this year. It is a really splendid exposition of the office and work of the Catholic layman, and it does not seem excessive to say that every Catholic layman should have it and try to form himself upon it. "Schools and Colleges," one feels inclined to say, "Please take notice." *The Real Presence* is also by the Bishop of Newport, and *The Immaculate Conception* by Canon Bagshawe. They belong to the miniature Devotional Series and are explanatory of the two dogmas. *The Real Presence* will be useful for those who are told that Transubstantiation is a doctrine founded merely on a mediæval and obsolete philosophy of substance.

The Annual Report of the Conference of Catholic Guardians (1898), and Mrs. V. M. Crawford's paper, *How Children are trained at Val des Bois*, which was read on that occasion, are

sent by the Catholic Guardians' Association (8, Cavour Street, Walworth). It seems that we have now five hundred Catholic Guardians to protect the interests of those who are called the children of the State, and are in a like special sense the children of the Church. Mrs. Crawford has always something interesting to say about Catholic social work abroad, as the pages before us, and also an article in this May number testify.

Mr. Britten's tracts entitled *Protestant Fiction* are already widely known, and their reappearance bound together in one volume will, it may be hoped, extend their circulation still more. Many will be attracted by them because they are so amusing, and that is quite as it should be. But they have also a lesson to teach. The stories which sound so ridiculous to us are seriously taken by a larger number than one could suppose, nor are these to be found only among the less educated classes. The real purpose of a book like *Protestant Fiction* is not merely to amuse Catholics, but to disillusion these people. Much in that way has been done by the Catholic Truth Society tracts already, and it will assist the good work to spread widely this little volume.

Messrs. Washbourne's latest five shilling edition of the *Roman Missal* for the laity is a very handy volume, clear in type, small in compass, and light in weight. What is still more serviceable about it is that it has the English and Irish appendices up to date, Benedictine and Jesuit appendices, and the ferial Masses for Lent. Messrs. Herder (of St. Louis) send some nice miniature editions of the *Key of Heaven*, the *Guide to Heaven*, &c., variously bound.

II.—MAGAZINES.

Some contents of foreign Periodicals :

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (April 1. Jubilee Number.)

Text of Apostolic Letter and Blessing given to the *Civiltà Cattolica* by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. The Fiftieth Year of the *Civiltà*. Dante's attitude towards Boniface VIII. The Berlin Edition of the Greek Patrology. The French Protectorate in Palestine.

— (April 15.)

The Concordat between Napoleon and Pius VII. in 1801. Art and the Museums. Italian Dialects. Italy's Bad Years. Reviews, &c.

DER KATHOLIK. (April.)

- St. John's Gospel, c. ii. v. 4. *J. Stiglmayer, S.J.* The Mass in Mediæval Germany. *A. Franz.* The Religious Convictions of Albert Durer. *A. Weber.* The Maintz Bibles. *F. Falk.* Reviews, &c.

L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE. (April.)

- Satan and Jesus. *A. Lémann.* Anglican Missions. *R. P. Ragey.* An up-to-date Hero. *Abbé Delfour.* The Census of Quirinus. *E. Jacquier.* Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (April.)

- The Growth of Anarchical Ideas. *S. von Dunin-Borkowski.* The Exploration of the Upper Nile. *J. Schwartz.* The Index of Forbidden Books. *J. Hilgers.* Faith and Unfaith. *R. Von Nostitz-Rieneck.* The Holy Mounts of Tuscany. *M. Meschler.* Reviews, &c.

The ÉTUDES (April 20.)

- Racine at the close of the Nineteenth Century. *V. Delaporte.* The Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus. *L. Méchineau.* "Neutrality" in Higher Grade University Teaching. *P. Targile.* French Africa. *H. Prélôt.* Two New Treatises of St. Peter Fourier. *L. Carrez.*

REVUE BÉNÉDICTINE.

- The Calculation of Easter. *R. Proost.* Ascetical Training in the Primitive Oriental Monasteries. *J. M. Besse.* Benedictine History. *W. Berlière.*

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE.

- Charitable Institutions in Germany of the Thirteenth Century. *E. Michael.* The Right of Property. *J. Oberhammer.* Tradition and Modern Critical Methods as regards the Old Testament. *L. Fonck.* Reviews, &c.

LA REVUE GÉNÉRALE. (April.)

- Florence. *H. Goffin.* Windthorst. *Ch. Woeste.* The Comte de Mérode and Josephine Bonaparte. *P. Verhaegen.* English Politicians—Mr. Balfour. *A. Charlot.*

STUDIEN UND MITTHEILUNGEN.

- The Cultivation of Art amongst the Cistercians in the Rhenish Provinces. *H. Hofer.* Servitia and Anniversaria in the Cistercian Abbey of Holy Cross. *G. Lanz.* Ecclesiastical and Political Events in the Tyrol under Bavarian Rule. *A. Schatz.* Reviews, &c.

